

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 739

IN 005 540

AUTHOR Cox, Carolyn, M.; Juergens, Bonnie  
TITLE Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Libraries.  
INSTITUTION AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, Dallas, Tex.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Nov 77  
NOTE 113p.; Some pages may be marginally legible due to type size  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Cataloging; Catalogs; \*Computer Output Microfilm; Libraries; Library Cooperation; \*Library Research; Microforms; \*Union Catalogs

ABSTRACT

This project proposed to develop and test the use of microform catalogs produced from computer-generated magnetic tape records in both fiche and film formats. The Computer Output Microform (COM) catalog developed for this purpose is a union list of titles from the five participating libraries--Houston and Dallas Public Libraries, Texas State Library, Waco-McLennan County Library, and Stephen F. Austin University Library. The project was divided into four phases: (1) conversion of data to machine-readable form; (2) microform catalog production; (3) catalog test; and (4) project evaluation. The following activities were documented: (1) vendor selection process and results; (2) production procedures and cost statistics for preparation of machine-readable bibliographic data using the OCLC system; (3) library staff and library user acceptance of the catalog formats; and (4) microform copies of the union catalog. The eight appendices include Input and Edit Procedures, Request for Proposal to COM Vendors, Analysis of Vendor's Bids, Sample Questionnaire (user), and the project Interviewer's Manual. (Author/JAB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED149739

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

## Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Libraries

By

Carolyn M. Cox

Bonnie Juergens

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carolyn M. Cox

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

AMIGOS Bibliographic Council

Dallas, Texas

November, 1977

1K003370

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

The project staff wishes to thank: the staff of the participating libraries for their help in the planning and evaluation stages of the project; Texas Woman's University and North Texas State University for the use of their terminals; all the professional associates who offered support and advice; Richard Jenson for the preparation of the questionnaires and the statistical analysis; Information Design, Menlo Park, California, for the loan of six ROM III microfilm readers; Realist, Inc., Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin, for the loan of six Vantage IV microfiche readers; and the schools of library science at North Texas State University and Texas Woman's University for assistance in locating terminal operators for the project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |                                             |    |
|------|---------------------------------------------|----|
| I.   | Introduction                                | 1  |
| II.  | Conversion of Data to Machine-Readable Form | 4  |
| III. | Microform Catalog Production                | 17 |
| IV.  | Catalog Test                                | 19 |
|      | A. General Introduction                     | 19 |
|      | B. Results                                  | 21 |
| V.   | Project Evaluation                          | 31 |

## APPENDICES

|               |                                     |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Appendix I.   | Coordinate Board                    |
| Appendix II   | Request for Proposal                |
| Appendix III. | Input and Edit Procedures           |
| Appendix IV.  | Final Production Statistics         |
| Appendix V.   | Request for Proposal to COM Vendors |
| Appendix VI.  | Analysis of Vendor's Bids           |
| Appendix VII. | Sample Questionnaire                |
| Appendix VII. | Interviewers Manual                 |

## Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Libraries

### I. INTRODUCTION

How long can the card catalog continue to serve the access needs of Texas libraries? How can librarians justify the rising costs of producing and maintaining card catalogs? Are reasonable alternatives available? And what is reasonable in terms of cost, availability, and acceptability by library users?

These questions were posed by representatives of Texas' two largest public libraries, the Houston Public Library and the Dallas Public Library during the summer of 1975. A study was proposed which would address the following points:

- A. Use of new technology to produce card catalog alternatives.
- B. Applicability of technological tools to libraries of varying sizes and collection needs.
- C. Cost alternatives and availability of vendors or suppliers of services.
- D. Acceptability levels of alternative methods for library staff members and for library users.

In an attempt to include varying types and sizes of Texas libraries, project participation was solicited from Waco-McLennan County Library, Stephen F. Austin University Library, and the Texas State Library, as well as the originating two large public libraries. The AMIGOS Bibliographic Council was invited to participate in an

administrative role. The project proposed to develop and test the use of microform catalogs produced from computer-generated magnetic tape records -- Computer Output Microform, or COM -- in both fiche and film forms. The COM catalog would represent a union list of titles from all five participating libraries. The combined Texana collections of the libraries numbered an estimated fifteen to twenty thousand monographic titles, a number considered to be large enough to provide a test catalog and small enough to manage production and testing in a one-year project. Thus it was decided that the six institutions would undertake a joint project to develop and test a union catalog of Texana monographs in fiche and film COM. A proposal to the Texas State Library for funding through LSCA-Title III was submitted and accepted.

The Ohio College Library Center's on-line shared cataloging system has been utilized by a number of Texas libraries since 1974. This system has, in all instances, been used to produce printed catalog cards or to produce magnetic tape records which are subsequently utilized in COM catalog production. None of the Texas libraries is currently using OCLC as an on-line replacement for the local public catalog. Furthermore, a number of small-to-medium-sized libraries have elected not to use OCLC or other on-line cataloging systems due to operational expense. Since this project is attempting to test catalog alternatives which are currently feasible for use by libraries of varying sizes and budgets, it was decided that an on-line catalog would not be part of the test. The OCLC system was utilized as a tool for providing records in machine-readable form, because it was a tool readily available to the participating libraries. Since conversion methods other than on-line access are available to Texas libraries, it was determined that use of such a tool would not obviate test results for smaller libraries' future use. At the same time, a number of side-benefits could be realized by using OCLC for the conversion tool: the full Library of Congress MARC bibliographic format would be utilized, and the Texana holdings would be available

for all OCLC-user libraries, whether in or outside the state of Texas. An unexpected benefit was the training of terminal operators who were subsequently hired by other libraries which were using OCLC.

A literature search revealed that a number of libraries throughout the country have converted to microform catalogs, either photo-reproduced or COM-generated, but no conclusive studies have compared the staff and library user acceptance of such catalogs; no comparison between fiche and film has been undertaken in a controlled test; no complete conversion, vendor solicitation, and production reports have been provided to the library community. The participating libraries' stated purpose in conducting the study was to make such data available, in its entirety, to interested librarians in Texas and throughout the country.

A Coordinate Board consisting of one representative from each of the five participating libraries and the Project Director (a staff member from AMIGOS<sup>1</sup>) met in June, 1976, to detail action plans for the project. The project was divided into four phases:

- I. Conversion of data to machine-readable form;
- II. Microform catalog production;
- III. Catalog test; and
- IV. Project evaluation.

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix I for a list of Coordinate Board and Project Director participants.

## II. PHASE I. Conversion of Data to Machine-Readable Form

### A. Review of Equipment and Site Preparation

The offices of the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council in Richardson, Texas, were selected for centralized input of the five participating libraries' cataloging data. Three OCLC-Model 100 cathode-ray-tube terminals were installed in a large workroom. This workroom became the project locus for the months of September, 1976 through mid-February, 1977. Cards were received from the participating libraries, counted and checked in, and sorted into packs to be searched and input by terminal operators. Constantly updated production schedules and work assignments were listed on the blackboard. A complete set of project instructions and input reference tools<sup>2</sup> were supplied to each terminal. During most of the input portion of the project, a printer attached to the master terminal was also available, but this was not required and was not often employed for project purposes.

In October of 1976, two terminal operators were hired to work part-time on the Dallas Public Library input from remote terminal locations. The Dallas Public Library cataloging copy was supplied to the project in print-out form containing incomplete bibliographic records ("incomplete" here refers to the fixed-length field format of the Dallas Public Library

<sup>2</sup>The minimum recommended core of reference tools to be available to each terminal operator at all times includes: Appendix III of On-Line Cataloging, fixed-field documentation, Country of Publication Codes, call number formatting instructions and examples, and MARC Decision for Retrospective Cataloging. The full text of On-line Cataloging, the PALINET Manual, and Self-Instructional Introduction to the OCLC Model 100 Terminal, along with AMIGOS Memoranda and OCLC Newsletters were available for easy reference.

printouts, which precluded full MARC record information requirements). Since the project did not have to observe the strictest security control over this data -- that is, unlike the shelf-list cards from the other participating libraries, the data was replaceable -- it was determined "safe" to allow the input to be done off-site using terminals from Texas Woman's University Library and North Texas State University Library in nearby Denton, Texas. No input of new records to the OCLC system was done from these incomplete print-outs, however.

B. Conversion of Data to Machine-Readable Form

The Coordinate Board members agreed that the conversion of Texana titles from shelf-list cards or library print-outs would be done centrally. The Project Director from AMIGOS would select and train a core of part-time terminal operators who would utilize the OCLC system to effect the conversion. Two areas of overriding concern in the initial stages of Phase I were: (1) shelf-list security measures and (2) microform record format specifications as applicable to input guidelines. These policy questions were resolved in the following fashion:

1. Shelf-list Security Measures

It was determined that the Project Director would implement security measures for each library's data based on the requirements of the individual library. Thus, three participating libraries sent boxes of shelf-list cards "Return Receipt Requested" through the U.S. mail. Each box of cards was "checked in" and recorded by central staff; actual cards were counted and separated into packs of 100, recorded by first, last, and one random cards using their call numbers for identification. The box of cards was

retained until processed by central staff, then "checked out" and returned to the home library via U.S. mail, special handling. The receipt of these boxes was scheduled for a cycle of three to six weeks but in some instances that "cycle" extended to more than two months.

Of the two remaining libraries, one chose to hand-deliver all shelf-list data, after which the same internal security measures as listed above were employed. The fifth library chose to provide the project with a computer-generated print-out of its Texana titles, which was hand-delivered. Project staff members were free to mark on the print-out sheets, even though the library expected its return after input was complete.

## 2. Microform Record Format Specifications as Applicable to Input Guidelines

The Coordinate Board specified the final microform catalogs to be three-way divided catalogs (name, title, and subject) containing full bibliographic records in each section. The display must also contain OCLC system control number, Library of Congress card number when available, and location stamps and call numbers for each library holding the title. Any "hit" or match of a title in hand with a record in the OCLC data base was to be accepted, whether an LC MARC record or a member-input record. When matches were not found in the data base, the project was to input the record based on LC copy from any participating library; Texas State Library local cataloging records; other participating libraries' local records. Input was to include monographic titles only, exclusive of genealogy, state documents, and selective federal and city documents. These guidelines were utilized by the Project Director to establish the following OCLC-related input strictures:

- a. In order for the location stamp and call number to be available for display in the COM record, project staff had to input the location stamp information in the 049 field (holding field) of each record. Libraries using OCLC for card production are accustomed to having location stamp information automatically printed on cards; this is a feature of the OCLC print programs and does not apply to data retained in the tape record. Libraries contemplating a change from OCLC-printed cards to the use of OCLC-produced magnetic tapes for COM catalog production must accommodate this variation in data retention.
- b. Because any call number field that is present at the time the OCLC record is used will be retained in the magnetic tape, it is vital that each library establish a hierarchy in call number field selection. In the Texana project, four of the five libraries used Dewey Decimal Classification; the remaining library used the Library of Congress Classification. For each participating library, the project established a first, second, or even third choice list of call number fields. This is specified in Request for Proposal, Appendix II.
- c. Because the project could not be sure that a COM vendor with full subject authority capability would be processing the tapes, terminal operators were asked to extend abbreviated words to full entries (i.e., 'U.S.' was to be changed to "United States" in filing entries) when working from records in the data base. This added to the complexity of the terminal operators' work, and slowed down processing time, but was considered to be a valuable time investment.

### 3. Input and Edit Procedures

Input and edit procedures were prepared by the Project Director prior to the training of terminal operators. These procedures were revised during the course of the project. The most complete set of procedures is provided in Appendix III of this report.

Conversion of data to machine-readable form using the OCLC system consisted of the following major activities:

- a. Searching the data base for all applicable titles submitted by the participating libraries.
- b. Changing data on the OCLC record to conform to local bibliographic and holdings information.
- c. Inputting new records into the OCLC system to be retained as a permanent part of the OCLC data base.
- d. Authority work.
- e. Record and statistics-keeping.

It was determined by the Coordinate Board that the Texas State Library records would be used to establish authority on entries for records which were not derived from Library of Congress copy. In theory, this principle was followed. In practice, it was very difficult to accomplish because the project staff members were working in somewhat of an "authority void." As a centralized input and editing pool, the terminal operators did not have access to the local authority files developed by the participating libraries. Three steps were taken to help alleviate this problem.

First, the Texas State Library records were processed before the other libraries' records whenever possible. Thus titles common to Texas State Library plus one or more of the other libraries would be input from the authoritative data first. At the same time, the staff worked to develop a project authority file to which they could turn whenever more than one form of entry became apparent. The development of this "local" authority file was very weak and the file did not provide the level of assistance that was expected. And third, an old edition of LC Subject Headings was borrowed from the University of Texas at Dallas Library to be used by project staff. All of these measures were inadequate and incomplete. Inadequate authority tools and procedures resulted in extended post-production edit procedures being required. Authority control should be mandatory for the development of any COM catalog.

Since September of 1975, OCLC member libraries have been required to input original cataloging according to Chapter Six of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and the International Standard Bibliographic Description for books. Shelf-list conversion projects are not required to adhere to this standard. The Texana materials which were input during this project included very old cataloging records which were devised according to a wide variety of local and national cataloging standards. The terminal operators were required to tag (format according to the MARC II description for machine-readable records) and input records of varying lengths and quality. Terminal operators were trained and their work revised extensively before they were allowed to input new records directly into the system. A large number of the records pertinent to the project were used more than once; that is, more than one of the participating libraries owned a large number of the Texana

titles and terminal operators had an opportunity to review records input for one library and later used by another. When the original record was superseded by a record from LC copy, or from a more complete local record, the original record was revised on-line<sup>3</sup>. Terminal operators were encouraged to seek assistance in tagging unusual or difficult records, and any "problem" records were put into an on-line OCLC "Save" file to be revised. Only the most competent of the terminal operators inputted records directly from shelf-list cards; the other terminal operators were assigned to searching, copy cataloging, or inputting records from workforms and storing them in "Save" for revision. In all, a total of 4,760 new records were input into the system.

#### 4. Personnel

Early in August, 1976, two library schools close to project headquarters were contracted to solicit student employment. Texas Woman's University and North Texas State University generously offered to post advertisements and to encourage students to seek this opportunity for training and OCLC experience.

<sup>3</sup>This is a laborious procedure which only works if the data-base record has not subsequently been used by another OCLC library. The procedure involves logging off one library's authorization number, logging on in the authorization number of the inputting library, correcting or completing the record, using the REPLACE command, logging off the inputting library authorization number, and logging back on in the authorization of the library whose data was being input at the beginning of this procedure.

Of the twenty terminal operators who participated in the project, six were library school students, seven were librarians who had completed an MLS program, two had undergraduate degrees or courses in library science, and six had clerical experience only. The Assistant to the Project Director, who began as a terminal operator and functioned in that capacity for one month, also had an MLS degree.

The training schedule included:

- a. Two-hour individual session at the terminal with each prospective terminal operator using the Self-Instructional Introduction to the OCLC Model 100 Terminal.
- b. Four-hour group MARC tagging training session.
- c. Individual assignments in tagging records onto paper workforms.
- d. Individual practice searching titles at the terminal. The amount of searching practice varied among terminal operators. The range was two to eight hours of total practice before the terminal operator was assigned to the next step in training.
- e. Copy cataloging demonstration and explanation of project instruction sheets.
- f. Copy cataloging practice in which the terminal operator performed full copy cataloging activity and put the completed records into the OCLC "Save" file to be revised by a supervisor. This level of activity continued until the terminal operator demonstrated a level

of competence which precluded revision by the supervisor. At all times, terminal operators flagged "problem" records and sought assistance from the supervisor. Some terminal operators were restricted to copy cataloging throughout the project's duration, either because they preferred this activity over tagging and inputting new records, or because they did not achieve a level of competency deemed necessary to participate in input cataloging. The project was extremely fortunate in the quality of terminal operators it attracted. The two off-site terminal operators who worked from printouts of records were restricted to copy cataloging because the data from which they worked was not complete enough to input new records into the data base.

- g. Input cataloging demonstration and explanation of project instructions in this area.
- h. Input cataloging practice in which the terminal operator performed full input from shelf-list cards and put the completed records into the "Save" file to be revised by the supervisor. This level of activity continued until the terminal operator demonstrated a level of competence which precluded revision by the supervisor.

Unlike training staff members in libraries new to the OCLC system, project staff training had the advantage of constant supervision by an experienced OCLC-system user and trainer. The above schedule might be incorporated into or compared with training of new terminal operators in active OCLC-member libraries, but is not recommended as a model

for training total staff members in a one-or-two-day session. The advantage this schedule provided was one of time; the training could be interspersed with as many hours of practice required on an individual basis. It should be noted that a "point of diminishing returns" in training and practice should be established, if only informally, especially in a project which is limited in time and budget as the Texana input project was. Some people are simply not suited to work requiring the attention to detail as that involved with cataloging and inputting through a tool such as the OCLC system.

#### 5. Production Statistics

Two major production terms will be used throughout the following discussion. Copy cataloging refers to the activity of searching the OCLC data base, locating a record which matches the title in hand, modifying that record in a number of ways, and using the UPDATE or PRODUCE function to add an institution symbol to the permanent data base record while obtaining the modified cataloging record locally. Input cataloging refers to the activity of searching the OCLC data base, not locating a record which matches the title in hand, creating cataloging copy and formatting it according to OCLC-modified MARC II requirements, and inputting the new record into the data base. Note that these definitions do not describe the quality or origin of the cataloging records. Copy cataloging can mean accepting an LC-MARC record or accepting a member-input record based on local cataloging or LC copy. Input cataloging can be derived from local or LC copy.

The goal of the Project Director was to provide a level of training and practice from which each terminal operator

could format and input directly from the shelf-list copy. This technique would accomplish a time savings in that the interim step of completing a paper workform could be eliminated. A further time savings would accrue because the procedure could be accomplished as part of the initial search of the data base. If the paper workform step is required, the terminal operator must search the data base first to determine that the record is not already available, turn the title over to the librarian who tags the copy, and then repeat a thorough search of the data base to be sure that the record has not been input by a member library in the intervening time.

The ideal workflow pattern for a retrospective conversion from shelf-list data was perceived to be the following:

1. Begin with title ascertained to be qualified for project use.
2. Search OCLC data base for title.
3. Is the title available from the data base?
4. If yes, perform copy cataloging activity; go on to next title.
5. If no, input copy directly on to terminal workform; go on to next title.

In practice, both personnel and system idiosyncracies combined to negate the efficacy of this "ideal" approach. The

greatest unknown at all times was system response time. Terminal operators found that certain aspects of the input operation were more efficiently executed at different times, based on system response. For instance, during periods of very fast response time, a terminal operator could accomplish a high number of copy cataloging transactions without the frustration of "interminable" waits between commands; the input cataloging, which is a slower procedure and involves much more operator time on the keyboard between activation of system commands, could be put off to be done during slow response time periods. Some terminal operators did not become proficient at inputting from the shelf-list, and were restricted to copy cataloging transactions only. During actual system down-time, the only work available to terminal operators was to tag cataloging copy onto paper workforms. Thus the majority of titles input by the project staff required more than one thorough search, which added to throughput time.

Terminal operators were originally told that production expectation was six input titles per hour and fifteen copy-cataloging titles per hour. These figures assumed an average response time of two to eight seconds. It was hoped that the terminal operators who achieved higher averages and the periods of slow response time. Spot-timings over the course of the input project indicate a wide range of system and personnel capabilities. The most impressive throughput statistics demonstrated a copy cataloging rate of thirty-five titles per hour and an input cataloging rate of fifteen titles per hour. These production rates were rare, especially the input cataloging rate.

The total number of titles manipulated by project staff was 22,202. (See final production statistics, Appendix IV). The total number of terminal operator hours used to accomplish production was 2,515. This configuration demonstrates an average of 8.83 production functions per hour. This "average" is including training time (for which terminal operators were paid), notoriously slow response time (part of the project coincided with the system degradation and implementation of OCLC's triple processor during October and November of 1976), and actual down-time. Assuming an average of 20 hours of training per terminal operator before full production level was reached, this would reduce the 2515 hours to 2,095 ( $2515 - 420 = 2,095$  hours). This brings the average production function per hour to 10.6. The slow response time and actual down-time factors are still a part of this "average."

A total of 59,261 searches was required to process the 22,202 titles. Thus for each title processed, an average of 2.67 searches was required. There were  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times as many copy cataloging transactions as there were input cataloging transactions.

### III. Phase II. MICROFORM CATALOG PRODUCTION

A Request for Proposal on computer-output-microform (COM) catalog production from OCLC-produced magnetic tapes was compiled by the Project Director during the months of October and November, 1976. Specifications were developed based on requirements agreed upon by the Coordinate Board at a meeting held in October. The full text of the Request for Proposal, including specifications, is contained in Appendix V.

The request for Proposal was sent to the following vendors:

BroDart, Inc.  
Blackwell North America, Inc.  
Informatics  
Library Interface Systems, Inc.  
Computer Microfilm International Corp.  
Science Press  
Auto-Graphics, Inc.  
Xerox

An analysis of the bids from the vendors is included in Appendix VI.

After reviewing proposals and capabilities of the responding vendors, BroDart, Inc. was selected to process the OCLC tapes and generate the microform catalog.

Upon completion of the input portion of the project the OCLC tapes were given to BroDart for processing and generation of the microform catalogs. A printout of the file from the vendor indicated that many entries would have to be corrected to bring some uniformity to the entries. Many subject cross-references were supplied by Texas State Library in order to make a viable final subject microform catalog. This type of activity had not been anticipated and required two weeks to complete.

Various delays in the generation of the catalogs occurred, namely:

- A. The last monthly tape was received from OCLC 30-days late due to a programming problem at OCLC.
- B. A portion of the corrections, typed using OCR font, had to be retyped because the typing was done using 12-pitch (Elite) instead of 10-pitch (Pica). The BroDart manual had not specified this requirement.
- C. After all the corrected OCR sheets were converted and received by BroDart, BroDart determined that a maintenance function to correct repeatable fields in one of their computer programs did not work. Since this affected ninety percent (90%) of the subject heading corrections, the output was delayed until BroDart fixed their computer program.
- D. BroDart had to rerun the entire OCLC input because from the printout it was evident that BroDart had selected additional non-Texana "holding libraries" from OCLC tapes of the Texas State Library and the Dallas Public Library.
- E. The microfilm output was inadvertently stored at BroDart rather than being shipped to the libraries immediately after its production.

#### IV. Phase III. CATALOG TEST AND RESULTS

##### A. General Description

The purpose of the catalog test was to test the acceptability level of the two alternative COM catalogs for library staff members and for library users. The five test sites included two large public libraries, one medium size public library, the state library and a university library.

Two companies, Information Design, Inc. and Realistic Corporation, donated ROM III microfilm readers and Vantage Model IV microfiche readers respectively. Since the purpose of the project was to evaluate only the two forms of micro-image catalogs, no attempt was made to compare the equipment. In most cases the equipment worked satisfactory and did not constitute a significant variable in the evaluation of the catalogs.

An independent research group was hired to develop a questionnaire and an interviewers manual for the survey. A sample questionnaire and interviewers manual appear as Appendixes VII and VIII. It was felt by members of the Coordinating Board that there were discrepancies in both the tone and format of the manual and questionnaire. A serious problem was that it did not directly relate to a library situation. These problems should be eliminated in any replication of the study.

The participating libraries varied in their preparation of the public services staff who were to conduct the survey. In the best situations the public services staff met to discuss with the Coordinating Board member the background and purpose of the study. The staff went over the questionnaire and manual to make

sure everything was clear. If there is no preparation of the public services staff, the survey results could be altered because of resistance by the staff to the survey rather than to the microforms.

The tests were administered by the public services staff. Each person filling out a survey form was supposed to be interviewed prior to filling out the form. However, this was not always the case because it took too much time for the user and the staff person. This lack of interview could account for some of the confusion on evaluation of the fiche and film which was evident on some of the survey forms.

After completion of the catalog tests the survey forms were completed and returned to project headquarters for analysis. The microfiche and microfilm readers were returned to the companies. The libraries retained the COM catalogs for their own use.

## B. Analysis and Test Results

### 1. Overall acceptance of microforms and microform preference

The research provided no indication of overall acceptance of microform as it was decided by The Research Director at the onset that the purpose was to compare types of microforms and not to compare traditional catalogs to microform catalogs. Based on this the survey coordinator was instructed to delete questions on this subject.

The overall evaluation by microform preference is relatively clearcut as 68.3% of those surveyed preferred microfilm and only 14.1% preferred microfiche. Also the majority of the persons preferring film were the most frequent users.

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE  | ABSOLUTE<br>FREQ | RELATIVE<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) | ADJUSTED<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) | CUM<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) |
|----------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| MICROFILM      | 1.    | 97               | 32.0                      | 68.3                      | 68.3                 |
| MICROFICHE     | 2.    | 20               | 6.6                       | 14.1                      | 82.4                 |
| NO PREFERENCE  | 3.    | 25               | 8.3                       | 17.6                      | 100.0                |
|                | 0.    | 161              | 53.1                      | MISSING                   | 100.0                |
|                | TOTAL | 303              | 100.0                     | 100.0                     |                      |

  

|             |        |               |       |          |       |
|-------------|--------|---------------|-------|----------|-------|
| MEAN        | 1.493  | STD ERR       | 0.065 | MEDIAN   | 1.232 |
| MODE        | 1.000  | STD DEV       | 0.779 | VARIANCE | 0.600 |
| KURTOSIS    | -0.327 | SKEWNESS      | 1.166 | RANGE    | 2.000 |
| MINIMUM     | 1.000  | MAXIMUM       | 3.000 |          |       |
| VALID CASES | 142    | MISSING CASES | 161   |          |       |

## 2. Overall Analysis of Ease of Using Fiche and Film

The most significant result of the overall evaluation of both film and fiche is that only 3.0% felt using fiche was difficult and only 0.3% felt using film was difficult. In addition only .7% felt using the fiche was impossible, while no respondent felt the film was impossible to use.

The overall evaluation of the fiche indicated some confusion of patrons as the majority 55.4% did not know how to evaluate the overall ability to use the microfiche catalog. However, the plurality of persons felt the fiche was "very easy" or "easy" with 15.2% and 25.7% respectfully responding to these categories.

The overall evaluation of the film indicated not only that fewer persons surveyed did not know how to evaluate but also a larger percentage 38.3% felt it was "very easy" to use and 22.8 felt it was "easy". The combination of these two categories indicates that, in fact, 61.1% or nearly 2 of every 3 users felt the film was easy to use.

# OVERALL USE OF FILM

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE  | ABSOLUTE<br>FREQ | RELATIVE<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) | ADJUSTED<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) | CUM<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) |
|----------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| VERY EASY      | 1.    | 116              | 38.3                      | 62.4                      | 62.4                 |
| EASY           | 2.    | 69               | 22.8                      | 37.1                      | 99.5                 |
| DIFFICULT      | 3.    | 1                | 0.3                       | 0.5                       | 100.0                |
| DON'T KNOW     | 0.    | 117              | 38.6                      | MISSING                   | 100.0                |
|                | TOTAL | 303              | 100.0                     | 100.0                     |                      |

|             |        |               |       |          |       |
|-------------|--------|---------------|-------|----------|-------|
| MEAN        | 1.382  | STD ERR       | 0.037 | MEDIAN   | 1.302 |
| MODE        | 1.000  | STD DEV       | 0.498 | VARIANCE | 0.248 |
| KURTOSIS    | -1.289 | SKEWNESS      | 0.623 | RANGE    | 2.000 |
| MINIMUM     | 1.000  | MAXIMUM       | 3.000 |          |       |
| VALID CASES | 186    | MISSING CASES | 117   |          |       |

# OVERALL USE OF FILME

| CATEGORY LABEL | CODE  | ABSOLUTE<br>FREQ | RELATIVE<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) | ADJUSTED<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) | CUM<br>FREQ<br>(PCT) |
|----------------|-------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| VERY EASY      | 1.    | 46               | 15.2                      | 34.1                      | 34.1                 |
| EASY           | 2.    | 78               | 25.7                      | 57.8                      | 91.9                 |
| DIFFICULT      | 3.    | 9                | 3.0                       | 6.7                       | 98.5                 |
| IMPOSSIBLE     | 4.    | 2                | 0.7                       | 1.5                       | 100.0                |
| DON'T KNOW     | 0.    | 168              | 55.4                      | MISSING                   | 100.0                |
|                | TOTAL | 303              | 100.0                     | 100.0                     |                      |

|             |       |               |       |          |       |
|-------------|-------|---------------|-------|----------|-------|
| MEAN        | 1.756 | STD ERR       | 0.055 | MEDIAN   | 1.776 |
| MODE        | 2.000 | STD DEV       | 0.640 | VARIANCE | 0.410 |
| KURTOSIS    | 1.000 | SKEWNESS      | 0.613 | RANGE    | 3.000 |
| MINIMUM     | 1.000 | MAXIMUM       | 4.000 |          |       |
| VALID CASES | 135   | MISSING CASES | 168   |          |       |

3. Analysis of Ability to use Catalog by the Type of Catalog

There is absolutely no difference between the type of catalog in relation to the individual's ability to use the catalog. Therefore determination of which type of catalog would be apropos to a particular library should be based on the ease of use and cost effectiveness of the catalog.

|            | <u>Yes<br/>(In Library)</u> | <u>Yes<br/>(Not in Library)</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Other</u> |
|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Microfiche | 66.9%                       | 18.5%                           | 10.5%     | 4.0%         |
| Microfilm  | 68.6                        | 18.3                            | 7.7       | 5.3          |

#### 4. Library by Preference

While there was some difference between libraries as to the type of microform catalogs which was preferred, all libraries preferred the microfilm catalogs to the microfiche. However this margin was very narrow in Waco, with the largest number of users 41.2% having no preference. This was contrasted in the Texas State Library by the fact that all users had a preference with 62.5% preferring the film and 37.5% preferring the fiche. The other three libraries were very close with only 1 user in 10 preferring the fiche, while 76.2% of Houston Public, 76.7%, of Stephan F. Austin and 62.5% of Dallas Public users preferred the microfilm.

While these results vary enough to justify the conclusion that the particular library does effect the preference of catalogs, the reasons for this difference are not clear. It does not appear that in this case the function of the library as to public or academic usage is a factor, nor does the library size appear to determine preference. A possible conclusion would seem to indicate that rather it is the internal workings of the library which determine catalog format preference.

LIBRARY NAME BY MICROFORM PREFERENCE

|                  | COUNT   | I    | ROW PCT | I     | MICROFIL | MICROFIL | NO PREFE | ROW   |
|------------------|---------|------|---------|-------|----------|----------|----------|-------|
|                  | COL PCT | IN   | HE      | RENCE |          |          |          | TOTAL |
|                  | TOT PCT | I    | 1.1     | 2.1   | 3.1      |          |          |       |
| VAR001           |         | I    | I       | I     | I        | I        | I        |       |
|                  | 1.      | I    | 5       | I     | 3        | I        | 0        | I     |
| TEXAS STATE LIBR | I       | 62.5 | I       | 37.5  | I        | 0.0      | I        | 5.6   |
|                  | I       | 5.2  | I       | 15.0  | I        | 0.0      | I        |       |
|                  | I       | 3.5  | I       | 2.1   | I        | 0.0      | I        |       |
|                  |         | I    | I       | I     | I        | I        | I        |       |
|                  | 2.      | I    | 49      | I     | 7        | I        | 8        | I     |
| HOUSTON PUBLIC   | I       | 76.2 | I       | 11.1  | I        | 12.7     | I        | 44.4  |
|                  | I       | 49.5 | I       | 35.0  | I        | 32.0     | I        |       |
|                  | I       | 33.9 | I       | 4.9   | I        | 5.6      | I        |       |
|                  |         | I    | I       | I     | I        | I        | I        |       |
|                  | 3.      | I    | 15      | I     | 2        | I        | 7        | I     |
| DALLAS PUBLIC    | I       | 62.5 | I       | 3.3   | I        | 29.2     | I        | 16.9  |
|                  | I       | 15.5 | I       | 10.0  | I        | 28.0     | I        |       |
|                  | I       | 10.6 | I       | 1.4   | I        | 4.9      | I        |       |
|                  |         | I    | I       | I     | I        | I        | I        |       |
|                  | 4.      | I    | 23      | I     | 4        | I        | 3        | I     |
| STEPHEN F AUSTIN | I       | 76.7 | I       | 13.3  | I        | 10.0     | I        | 21.1  |
|                  | I       | 23.7 | I       | 20.0  | I        | 12.0     | I        |       |
|                  | I       | 16.2 | I       | 2.8   | I        | 2.1      | I        |       |
|                  |         | I    | I       | I     | I        | I        | I        |       |
|                  | 5.      | I    | 6       | I     | 4        | I        | 7        | I     |
| WACO             | I       | 35.3 | I       | 23.5  | I        | 41.2     | I        | 12.0  |
|                  | I       | 6.2  | I       | 20.0  | I        | 28.0     | I        |       |
|                  | I       | 4.2  | I       | 2.8   | I        | 4.9      | I        |       |
|                  |         | I    | I       | I     | I        | I        | I        |       |
| COLUMN           |         | 97   |         | 20    |          | 25       |          | 142   |
| TOTAL            |         | 68.3 |         | 14.1  |          | 17.6     |          | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 19.35498 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0131

## 5. Age by Preference

While a user's age does appear to affect the choice of format for the catalogs, there is a curious relationship in that the persons 21 to 35 years of age appear to have the highest preference for microfilm, with 74.4% of the users in this age bracket indicating a preference for film. The preference for film decreases on both sides of this age group, with 62.5% of users 14 to 20 and 0.0% of those under 14 preferring film. At the same time the two groups in the older brackets also decrease in their preference for film. The most significant statistic shows that all other age groups, except the 21 to 35 bracket, also do not significantly increase their preference for fiche but rather have a higher percentage which have no preference.

| VARJ22       | ROW<br>COL | PCT<br>PCT | IMICROFIL<br>IM | MICROFIC<br>HE | NO PREFE<br>RENCE | ROW<br>TOTAL |
|--------------|------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|
|              |            |            |                 |                |                   |              |
|              |            |            |                 |                |                   |              |
|              |            |            | 1.1             | 2.1            | 3.1               |              |
| 1.           | 1          | 0          | 1               | 1              | 2                 | 3            |
| UNDER 14 YRS |            | 0.0        | 33.3            | 66.7           |                   | 2.1          |
|              |            | 0.0        | 5.0             | 8.0            |                   |              |
|              |            | 0.0        | 0.7             | 1.4            |                   |              |
| 2.           | 1          | 5          | 1               | 1              | 2                 | 8            |
| 14 TO 20 YRS |            | 62.5       | 12.5            | 25.0           |                   | 5.6          |
|              |            | 5.2        | 5.0             | 8.0            |                   |              |
|              |            | 3.5        | 0.7             | 1.4            |                   |              |
| 3.           | 1          | 61         | 13              | 8              |                   | 82           |
| 21 TO 35 YRS |            | 74.4       | 15.9            | 9.8            |                   | 57.7         |
|              |            | 62.9       | 65.0            | 32.0           |                   |              |
|              |            | 43.0       | 9.2             | 5.6            |                   |              |
| 4.           | 1          | 16         | 1               | 6              |                   | 23           |
| 36 TO 50 YRS |            | 69.6       | 4.3             | 26.1           |                   | 16.2         |
|              |            | 16.5       | 5.0             | 24.0           |                   |              |
|              |            | 11.3       | 0.7             | 4.2            |                   |              |
| 5.           | 1          | 15         | 4               | 7              |                   | 26           |
| OVER 50 YRS  |            | 57.7       | 15.4            | 26.9           |                   | 18.3         |
|              |            | 15.5       | 20.0            | 28.0           |                   |              |
|              |            | 10.6       | 2.8             | 4.9            |                   |              |
| COLUMN       |            | 97         | 20              | 25             |                   | 142          |
| TOTAL        |            | 68.3       | 14.1            | 17.6           |                   | 100.0        |

CHI SQUARE = 14.97358 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0397

6. Microform Preference by Education & Previous Usage of Microform

It is tempting to draw certain conclusions which link previous microform experiences to both education and age. The statistics indicate that approximately the same percentage of persons who are 21 to 35, and who frequently use microforms and who have some college, overwhelmingly prefer the microfilm. Further analysis could confirm that this group also finds microfilm easier and faster, while the other groups of users still prefer the film except those under 14 who are really too small a sample to consider statistically reliable.

While these statistics indicate that there is no one type of catalog that is absolutely better than all others, they do indicate that as the users familiarity with microforms increases the preference for the microfilm catalog increases. Assuming that persons not in college, or those who attended junior college are in the "some college" category, and that those persons 21 to 35 have the greatest potential to exposure to microforms, the conclusion would be that the future directions of microform catalogs should be toward microfilm, if the interest in the users is the prime deciding factor.

# Microform Preference by Education & Previous Usage of Microform

| VAR021        | ROW | PCT | COL  | PCT | IM   | MICROFIL | MICROFIL | NO    | PREFE | ROW   |
|---------------|-----|-----|------|-----|------|----------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
|               |     |     |      |     |      | ME       |          | RENCE |       | TOTAL |
|               | TOT | PCT | I    |     | 1.1  |          | 2.1      |       | 3.1   |       |
|               | 1.  | 1   | 0    | 1   | 1    | 1        | 1        | 1     | 1     | 2     |
| ELEMENTARY    |     | 1   | 0.0  | 1   | 50.0 | 1        | 50.0     | 1     | 1.4   |       |
|               |     | 1   | 0.0  | 1   | 5.0  | 1        | 4.0      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | 1   | 0.0  | 1   | 0.7  | 1        | 0.7      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | -1  | -1   | -1  | -1   | -1       | -1       | -1    | -1    |       |
| HIGH SCHOOL   | 2.  | 1   | 1    | 1   | 1    | 1        | 3        | 1     | 5     |       |
|               |     | 1   | 20.0 | 1   | 20.0 | 1        | 60.0     | 1     | 3.5   |       |
|               |     | 1   | 1.0  | 1   | 5.0  | 1        | 12.0     | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | 1   | 0.7  | 1   | 0.7  | 1        | 2.1      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | -1  | -1   | -1  | -1   | -1       | -1       | -1    | -1    |       |
| SOME COLLEGE  | 3.  | 1   | 25   | 1   | 4    | 1        | 1        | 1     | 30    |       |
|               |     | 1   | 83.3 | 1   | 13.3 | 1        | 3.3      | 1     | 21.1  |       |
|               |     | 1   | 25.8 | 1   | 20.0 | 1        | 4.0      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | 1   | 17.6 | 1   | 2.8  | 1        | 0.7      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | -1  | -1   | -1  | -1   | -1       | -1       | -1    | -1    |       |
| COLLEGE GRAD  | 4.  | 1   | 26   | 1   | 5    | 1        | 8        | 1     | 39    |       |
|               |     | 1   | 66.7 | 1   | 12.8 | 1        | 20.5     | 1     | 27.5  |       |
|               |     | 1   | 26.8 | 1   | 25.0 | 1        | 32.0     | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | 1   | 18.3 | 1   | 3.5  | 1        | 5.6      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | -1  | -1   | -1  | -1   | -1       | -1       | -1    | -1    |       |
| POST GRADUATE | 5.  | 1   | 45   | 1   | 9    | 1        | 12       | 1     | 66    |       |
|               |     | 1   | 68.2 | 1   | 13.6 | 1        | 18.2     | 1     | 46.5  |       |
|               |     | 1   | 46.4 | 1   | 45.0 | 1        | 48.0     | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | 1   | 31.7 | 1   | 6.3  | 1        | 8.5      | 1     |       |       |
|               |     | -1  | -1   | -1  | -1   | -1       | -1       | -1    | -1    |       |
| COLUMN TOTAL  |     |     | 97   |     | 20   |          | 25       |       | 142   |       |
|               |     |     | 68.3 |     | 14.1 |          | 17.6     |       | 100.0 |       |

CHI SQUARE = 16.06992 WITH 8 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0414

# 7. Microform Preference by Staff or Patron:

There is no real discernable difference between staff members and library patrons in regards to microform preference. Of those respondents who were classified as staff, 64.7% preferred microfilm, 17.6% preferred microfiche, and 17.6% indicated no preference. Those who were classified as patrons indicated a slightly higher preference for microfilm with 69.4% saying they preferred microfilm, 13.0% preferred microfiche, and 17.6% again indicating no preference.

|         | ROW<br>COL | PCT | MICROFIL |     | MICROFICHE |     | NO PREFERENCE |     | ROW<br>TOTAL |
|---------|------------|-----|----------|-----|------------|-----|---------------|-----|--------------|
|         |            |     | TOT      | PCT | TOT        | PCT | TOT           | PCT |              |
| VAR002  |            |     | 1.1      |     | 2.1        |     | 3.1           |     |              |
| STAFF   | 1.         | 1   | 22       | 1   | 6          | 1   | 6             | 1   | 34           |
|         |            | 1   | 64.7     | 1   | 17.6       | 1   | 17.6          | 1   | 23.9         |
|         |            | 1   | 22.7     | 1   | 30.0       | 1   | 24.0          | 1   |              |
|         |            | 1   | 15.5     | 1   | 4.2        | 1   | 4.2           | 1   |              |
| PATRONS | 2.         | 1   | 75       | 1   | 14         | 1   | 19            | 1   | 108          |
|         |            | 1   | 69.4     | 1   | 13.0       | 1   | 17.6          | 1   | 76.1         |
|         |            | 1   | 77.3     | 1   | 70.0       | 1   | 76.0          | 1   |              |
|         |            | 1   | 52.6     | 1   | 9.9        | 1   | 13.4          | 1   |              |
| COLUMN  |            |     | 97       |     | 20         |     | 25            |     | 142          |
| TOTAL   |            |     | 66.3     |     | 14.1       |     | 17.6          |     | 100.0        |

CHI SQUARE = 0.44788 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.7835

## 8. Frequency of Library Use by Preference

An analysis of preference by frequency of library use definitely indicates that the more frequently a person uses the library the more definite are their opinions about which catalog they prefer. While 42.9% of those who used the library only 1-12 time per year had no preference, 21.7% of those who used it 1-4 times per month had no preference, and only 12.6% of those who used the library 1 or more times per week had no preference.

The frequency of library use also increased the preference for the microfilm over the microfiche catalog. With 74.7% of the most frequent users preferring film, 69.6% of the next most frequently, 42.9% of the next to last frequent and none of the least frequent users preferring film it is obvious that the more a person uses the library the more they care about what form the catalog is in and the more they would prefer the microfilm catalog.

| VAR010           | ROW<br>COL | PCT<br>PCT | MICROFILM |       | MICROFICHE |      | NO PREFERENCE |    | ROW<br>TOTAL |
|------------------|------------|------------|-----------|-------|------------|------|---------------|----|--------------|
|                  |            |            | IF        | MC    | IF         | MC   | REF           | CE |              |
|                  |            | TOT        | PCT       | I     | 1.1        | 2.1  | 3.1           |    |              |
| 1.               | I          | 65         | I         | 11    | I          | 11   | I             |    | 87           |
| ONE + TIMES PER  | I          | 74.7       | I         | 12.6  | I          | 12.6 | I             |    | 61.7         |
|                  | I          | 67.0       | I         | 55.0  | I          | 45.8 | I             |    |              |
|                  | I          | 46.1       | I         | 7.8   | I          | 7.8  | I             |    |              |
| 2.               | I          | 16         | I         | 2     | I          | 5    | I             |    | 23           |
| 1 TO 4 TIME PER  | I          | 69.6       | I         | 8.7   | I          | 21.7 | I             |    | 16.3         |
|                  | I          | 16.5       | I         | 10.0  | I          | 20.8 | I             |    |              |
|                  | I          | 11.3       | I         | 1.4   | I          | 3.5  | I             |    |              |
| 3.               | I          | 6          | I         | 2     | I          | 6    | I             |    | 14           |
| 1 TO 12 PER YEAR | I          | 42.9       | I         | 14.3  | I          | 42.9 | I             |    | 9.5          |
|                  | I          | 6.2        | I         | 10.0  | I          | 25.0 | I             |    |              |
|                  | I          | 4.3        | I         | 1.4   | I          | 4.3  | I             |    |              |
| 4.               | I          | 0          | I         | 1     | I          | 0    | I             |    | 1            |
| ONCE OR LESS     | I          | 0.0        | I         | 100.0 | I          | 0.0  | I             |    | 0.7          |
|                  | I          | 0.0        | I         | 5.0   | I          | 0.0  | I             |    |              |
|                  | I          | 0.0        | I         | 0.7   | I          | 0.0  | I             |    |              |
| 5.               | I          | 10         | I         | 4     | I          | 2    | I             |    | 16           |
| OTHER            | I          | 62.5       | I         | 25.0  | I          | 12.5 | I             |    | 11.3         |
|                  | I          | 10.3       | I         | 20.0  | I          | 8.3  | I             |    |              |
|                  | I          | 7.1        | I         | 2.0   | I          | 1.4  | I             |    |              |
| COLUMN           |            | 97         |           | 20    |            | 24   |               |    | 141          |
| TOTAL            |            | 68.8       |           | 14.2  |            | 17.0 |               |    | 100.0        |

CHI SQUARE = 16.87236 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0315

#### 9. Ability to use Catalog by Type of Search

There are two major points that are indicated by the statistics on the ability to use the catalog by type of search. First is that people who are looking for a particular author or title (76.2 and 75.0% respectively) are more likely to find the material needed. While only 63.5% who were looking for material on a particular subject found what they needed in the library.

The second point which is more appropos to this study is that the type of search does not significantly affect the ability to use the microform catalog. There were only minor statistical differences between those who were conducting different types of searches that could not use the catalog. While there were slightly fewer users (7.7%) who had difficulty doing subject searches than those doing author, title or combination (11.9, 8.3 and 10.3% respectively) it can only be said that microform searches are slightly easier in the subject and title area than author and combination.

# Ability to use Catalog by Type of Search

|              | ROW    | PCT | YES-IV | YES | NOT  | NO | OTHER | ROW   |       |
|--------------|--------|-----|--------|-----|------|----|-------|-------|-------|
|              | COL    | PCT | 1      |     |      |    |       | TOTAL |       |
|              | TOT    | PCT | 1      | 1.1 | 2.1  |    | 3.1   | 4.1   |       |
| VAROCH       |        |     |        |     |      |    |       |       |       |
|              | 1.     | 1   | 32     | 1   | 4    | 1  | 5     | 1     | 42    |
| AUTHOR       |        | 1   | 76.2   | 1   | 5.5  | 1  | 11.9  | 1     | 14.2  |
|              |        | 1   | 15.9   | 1   | 7.4  | 1  | 14.2  | 1     |       |
|              |        | 1   | 10.8   | 1   | 1.4  | 1  | 1.7   | 1     |       |
|              |        |     |        |     |      |    |       |       |       |
|              | 2.     | 1   | 18     | 1   | 4    | 1  | 2     | 1     | 24    |
| TITLE        |        | 1   | 75.0   | 1   | 16.7 | 1  | 8.3   | 1     | 8.1   |
|              |        | 1   | 5.0    | 1   | 7.4  | 1  | 7.7   | 1     |       |
|              |        | 1   | 6.1    | 1   | 1.4  | 1  | 0.7   | 1     |       |
|              |        |     |        |     |      |    |       |       |       |
|              | 3.     | 1   | 49     | 1   | 30   | 1  | 12    | 1     | 156   |
| SUBJECT      |        | 1   | 63.5   | 1   | 24.4 | 1  | 7.7   | 1     | 52.9  |
|              |        | 1   | 49.3   | 1   | 70.4 | 1  | 46.2  | 1     |       |
|              |        | 1   | 33.6   | 1   | 12.9 | 1  | 4.1   | 1     |       |
|              |        |     |        |     |      |    |       |       |       |
|              | 4.     | 1   | 49     | 1   | 8    | 1  | 7     | 1     | 68    |
| COMBINATIONS |        | 1   | 72.1   | 1   | 11.8 | 1  | 10.3  | 1     | 23.1  |
|              |        | 1   | 24.4   | 1   | 14.8 | 1  | 26.9  | 1     |       |
|              |        | 1   | 16.6   | 1   | 2.7  | 1  | 2.4   | 1     |       |
|              |        |     |        |     |      |    |       |       |       |
|              | 5.     | 1   | 3      | 1   | 0    | 1  | 0     | 1     | 5     |
| OTHER        |        | 1   | 60.6   | 1   | 0.0  | 1  | 0.0   | 1     | 1.7   |
|              |        | 1   | 1.5    | 1   | 0.0  | 1  | 0.0   | 1     |       |
|              |        | 1   | 1.0    | 1   | 0.0  | 1  | 0.0   | 1     |       |
|              |        |     |        |     |      |    |       |       |       |
|              | COLUMN |     | 201    |     | 54   |    | 16    |       | 295   |
|              | TOTAL  |     | 68.1   |     | 18.3 |    | 6.8   |       | 100.0 |

CHI SQUARE = 24.52979 WITH 12 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.0152

# 10. Type of Search by Frequency of Use

The statistics indicate that the most frequent search in the catalogs involved in the research were subject searches with 51.8% of all users conducting subject searches, 8.0% conducting title searches, 14.7% conducting author searches, and 23.1% conducting some type of combination.

The statistics also indicate that the less frequently the person uses the library the more likely they are to conduct a library search. The percentage of persons conducting a subject search increases from 50.9% to 53.4% to 56.0% to 75% in each category as the frequency of library use declines.

The searches other than subject appear to have no significant correlation but indicate that they are randomly distributed and demonstrate no consistent trend.

|                  | ROW<br>COL | PCT<br>PCT | I | AUTHOR | TITLE | SUBJECT | COMBINAT<br>ION | OTHER | ROW<br>TOTAL |
|------------------|------------|------------|---|--------|-------|---------|-----------------|-------|--------------|
|                  |            |            |   | 1.1    | 2.1   | 3.1     | 4.1             | 5.1   |              |
| VAR019           |            |            |   |        |       |         |                 |       |              |
| ONE + TIMES PER  | 1.         | 1          | 1 | 22     | 10    | 82      | 43              | 4     | 161          |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 13.7   | 6.2   | 50.9    | 26.7            | 2.5   | 53.8         |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 50.0   | 41.7  | 52.9    | 62.3            | 57.1  |              |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 7.4    | 3.3   | 27.4    | 14.4            | 1.3   |              |
| 1 TO 4 TIME PER  | 2.         | 1          | 1 | 13     | 6     | 31      | 6               | 2     | 59           |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 22.4   | 10.3  | 53.4    | 10.3            | 3.4   | 19.4         |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 29.5   | 25.0  | 26.0    | 8.7             | 28.6  |              |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 4.3    | 2.0   | 10.4    | 2.0             | 0.7   |              |
| 1 TO 12 PER YEAR | 3.         | 1          | 1 | 3      | 4     | 28      | 14              | 1     | 50           |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 6.0    | 8.0   | 56.0    | 28.0            | 2.0   | 16.7         |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 6.8    | 16.7  | 18.1    | 20.3            | 14.3  |              |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 1.0    | 1.3   | 9.4     | 4.7             | 0.3   |              |
| ONCE OR LESS PER | 4.         | 1          | 1 | 0      | 1     | 3       | 0               | 0     | 4            |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 0.0    | 25.0  | 75.0    | 0.0             | 0.0   | 1.3          |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 0.0    | 4.2   | 1.9     | 0.0             | 0.0   |              |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 0.0    | 0.3   | 1.0     | 0.0             | 0.0   |              |
| OTHER            | 5.         | 1          | 1 | 6      | 3     | 11      | 6               | 0     | 26           |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 23.1   | 11.5  | 42.3    | 23.1            | 0.0   | 8.7          |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 13.6   | 12.5  | 7.1     | 8.7             | 0.0   |              |
|                  |            | 1          | 1 | 2.0    | 1.0   | 3.7     | 2.0             | 0.0   |              |
| COLUMN TOTAL     |            |            |   | 44     | 24    | 155     | 69              | 7     | 299          |
|                  |            |            |   | 14.7   | 8.0   | 51.8    | 23.1            | 2.3   | 100.0        |

CHI SQUARE = 12.32442 WITH 16 DEGREES OF FREEDOM SIGNIFICANCE = 0.3052

## V. Phase IV. PROJECT EVALUATION

The results presented in this report can serve as a preliminary basis for the decision to install a microform catalog in individual libraries. There were several variables not examined which might have affected user preference, in particular library staff attitudes towards fiche or film; however, from the results obtained through this study, it seems apparent that library users and staff indicated a preference for microfilm over microfiche catalogs.

There were some difficulties in the usage of the catalogs not directly related to the COM format. The catalogs were not a complete holdings list of all the Texana collection for a given library and thus frustrated some users. There were some differences in the filing rules between the main card catalog and the COM catalogs. Users also complained about the register on the index of the ROM III not being properly aligned with the records.

The delays in production of the catalogs resulted in a test conducted during a very slow time of the year. Staff members felt that Texana users were not "typical" library users in that they were searching for narrow highly specific topics and were more familiar with microforms than other users.

Libraries contemplating a change from printed cards to microform catalogs have a number of vendor options with varying cost alternatives. The vendor's authority control, or lack thereof, may make a great deal of difference in cost. Authority control should be mandatory in any conversion project. The appearance of the bibliographic record should sufficiently resemble the current card format, to aid users in use and strengthen acceptability.

One major criticism of the format of the record in the microform was the appearance of the call number. Call numbers were not formatted in the same way in the COM catalogs as they appear on the printed cards. Users got confused and picked up only one portion of the call number.

The technology is available to make microform catalogs a viable alternative to the traditional catalog. With the ready access to the library's holdings on magnetic tape, conversion projects become easier. Once the decision has been made to convert to a microform catalog, user acceptability is high.

APPENDIX I.

COORDINATING BOARD

Mr. R. E. Getz  
Technical Services Director  
Texas State Library  
Capitol Station  
Austin, Texas 78711

Mr. Paul Medley  
Director  
Waco-McLennan County Library  
1717 Austin Avenue  
Waco, Texas 76701

Mr. Jay Clark  
Head, Technical Services  
Houston Public Library  
500 McKinney Avenue  
Houston, Texas 77002

Also:  
Ms. Ann Adams  
Head, Catalog Department

Ms. Peggy Meek  
Head, Catalog Department  
Stephen F. Austin State University  
Library  
P. O. Box 3055  
SFA Station  
Nacagdoches, Texas 75962

Ms. Ann Armbrister  
Catalog Department  
Dallas Public Library  
1954 Commerce Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201

Also:  
Ms. Chris Borgman  
Systems Librarian

PROJECT DIRECTOR PARTICIPANTS

Ms. Bonnie Juergens  
Project Director  
AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
11300 North Central Expressway  
Suite 321  
Dallas, Texas 75243  
Now with CLSI

Mr. James Kennedy  
Executive Director  
AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
11300 North Central Expressway  
Suite 321  
Dallas, Texas 75243

7

APPENDIX II.

**AUTHORIZATION FOR APPLICATION**  
for  
**Library Services and Construction Act**  
**Federal Fiscal Year 1976**

INTERUNIVERSITY COUNCIL OF THE NORTH TEXAS AREA

Name of Contracting Agency

P. O. Box 688, Richardson, Texas

Mailing Address

**Authorization to make application:**

Project Initiator (signature)

James H. Kennedy

Typewritten or printed name above

\*AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
P. O. Box 688

Mailing Address

Richardson, Texas 75080

City and Zip Code

March 31, 1976

Date

\*AMIGOS Bibliographic Council is  
an agency of the Interuniversity  
Council of the North Texas Area

Librarian (signature)

Typewritten or printed name  
above

**Representative of Governing Authority**  
**Empowered to Enter Into Grant**  
**Agreements and Contracts**

Executive Director

Title

James H. Kennedy

Typewritten or printed name above

\* AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
P. O. Box 688, Richardson, Tx.  
Full Mailing Address

March 31, 1976

Date

75080

LSCA COVER SHEET  
Title III Application  
FY 1976

Title of Project: Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Librari

Contracting Agency: Interuniversity Council of the North Texas Area  
(name of library administering grant)

Initiator:  
(Applicant)

Name James Kennedy

Position Executive Director

Address AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
P. O. Box 688

Richardson, Texas 75080

Telephone 214-690-2595

Project Director

Name Bonnie Juergens

Position Library Liaison Officer

Address AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
P. O. Box 688

Richardson, Texas 75080

Telephone 214-690-2595

Name and address of Local Fiscal Officer who will be responsible for administering the funds.

Name Lee Crandell

Position Business Manager

Address Interuniversity Council of the North  
Texas Area

P. O. Box 688  
Richardson, Texas 75080

Telephone 214-231-7211

Amount of grant funds requested to implement this project:

Level A: \$29,744.00

Level B: \$47,910.00

Level C: \_\_\_\_\_

MICROFORM CATALOGS:  
A VIABLE ALTERNATIVE FOR TEXAS LIBRARIES?

I. ABSTRACT

This project will develop and test dual Computer Output Microform (COM) catalogs of the Texana collections of 5 libraries in Texas. The union catalogs will be produced by vendors to be selected during the project; the selection process, based on a competitive bid, will be documented to assist libraries in future decision-making procedures. Each participating library will test the use of the COM-produced union catalog in two formats: microfiche and microfilm. The project will document and/or make available to the professional community the following:

1. Vendor selection process and results;
2. Production procedures and cost statistics for preparation of machine-readable bibliographic data using the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) system;
3. Participating library staff acceptance of the catalog formats;
4. Library user acceptance of the catalog formats; and
5. Microform copies of the union catalog.

## II. NEEDS

A. The steadily increasing costs of card catalog production and maintenance have forced librarians to develop machine-produced alternatives. The cost of card catalogs is rising as a result of 1) the increasing rate of title publication, 2) the growth of library collections and the parallel increase in both size and complexity of card catalogs, and 3) the steady rise of personnel and supply costs required for production and maintenance of card catalogs. Some large card catalogs have already been closed as a result of rising costs. The New York Public Library is one of these. The Library of Congress has begun planning the closing of its catalog by 1980. Both decisions were based on studies that indicated the card catalogs were no longer economically feasible. The cost studies, along with documentation on the procedures which were or will be used to convert the card catalogs at these large institutions, have not been made available to the professional community.

Although reports are available which state the existence of COM-catalogs in academic and state

libraries (see Bierman<sup>1</sup>, Myers<sup>2</sup>, and Kuhner<sup>3</sup>), no documentation on vendor selection processes, costs, data preparation, or library staff acceptance has been made available. Greene<sup>4</sup> has reported extensively on the development and user acceptance of a microfiche catalog for a large university library. In the last five years, a wide range of computer catalog products have been developed by a number of commercial sources. The most cost-effective catalogs have been produced by Computer Output Microform (COM), a magnetic-tape-to-film process. But no documentation is available which demonstrates a comparative use analysis of both microfiche and microfilm catalogs. Many libraries in Texas have little or no experience with this technology. However, they do

---

<sup>1</sup>Bierman, Kenneth John. "Automated Alternatives to Card Catalogs: The Current State of Planning and Implementation." Journal of Library Automation, vol. 8, no. 4, Dec., 1975. pp. 277-298.

<sup>2</sup>Meyer, Richard W. and John F. Kanpp. "COM Catalog Based on OCLC Records." Journal of Library Automation, vol. 8, no. 4, Dec., 1975. pp. 312-321.

<sup>3</sup>Kuhner, D. A. "Sprague Library Adopts Microfiche Catalog." Sci-Tech News, vol. 29, July, 1975. p. 84

<sup>4</sup>Greene, Robert J. "Microform Library Catalogs and the LENDS Microfiche Catalog." Microform Review, vol. 4, no. 1, Jan., 1975. pp. 30-34

suffer from the rising personnel costs of maintaining their card catalogs. These institutions lack the resources that would allow them to experiment in developing cataloging systems using the new computer alternatives. Also smaller institutions lack the personnel resources with expertise in preparing bid specifications to provide the most effective use of the new technology and media usage, while protecting their investment in time and money. Statistical data on costs, production procedures, effective use of time, and acceptance documentation will prove highly useful to library planners in Texas.

The problem, then, is the lack of documentation on centralized input from several sources, vendor selection, microimage production, and use of COM catalogs as an alternative to the card catalog. Are fiche catalogs less expensive than film catalogs to produce? Are readers available which are convenient, inexpensive, and durable? Will library staff members accept microform access to the collections? Can Texas librarians locate local or regional vendors with competitive prices and quality products? These are the unanswered questions

which prevent librarians from considering a COM-produced catalog a viable alternative to the card catalog.

- B. This project will help solve the problem by providing an analysis of the cost and effectiveness of COM catalogs in two media. It will document the cost of personnel and equipment, the availability of quality products, and, perhaps most important, the library staff acceptance of these catalog media. Full review of all procedures will be reported to the library community. Library planners will have documentation available which will enable them to make better-informed decisions about catalog needs and production costs. Ultimately, this information will assist librarians to generate computer-produced, cost effective catalog systems in their libraries.
- C. 1. The monetary savings for individual libraries will be on two levels. Library administrators can integrate the data into their planning projects, thus saving personnel time and consultant expenses. If libraries determine from this study that COM catalogs based on

local or regional production are cost-and time-effective, this project will be the germination of (projected) wide savings in technical services appropriations. Conversely, if this study shows that COM catalogs are not a viable alternative for Texas libraries at this time, the foundation will have been laid for librarians to seek other means of cutting processing expenses.

- 2-3. It is projected that inter-library resource sharing can be facilitated by distribution of COM catalogs. Dissemination of holdings information on an intra-regional or intra-state basis, through union or single-library COM catalog production, can expand the resources of libraries throughout the state. This project will provide informational input which can be utilized by librarians planning such cooperative efforts.

- D. Besides providing management tools for decision-making, this project will provide a partial union catalog, in both fiche and film format, of monograph collections of the participating

libraries. The union catalog(s) will contain complete bibliographic records, including call numbers and holdings information. The microform catalogs will be made available to the participating libraries for use and testing with their users, and can be reproduced for distribution to other libraries in Texas upon demand.

Since the conversion instrument will be the Ohio College Library Center's (OCLC) on-line catalog, the holdings of the Texana collections will be made available to OCLC users throughout the state (currently 37 libraries) and the country (approximately 915 libraries). This project represents the first in-depth retrospective conversion of bibliographic records of monographs contained in Texana collections in the state.\* Although many of the states' libraries are cataloging current acquisitions of Texana through the OCLC system, thereby making the collection information publicly available, none of the Texas libraries has heretofore instituted a program of retrospective conversion of its entire Texana collection.

---

\*Preliminary sampling of Dallas Public Library and Houston Public Library holdings suggest a 55/45 ratio of records not in the data base/to records found in the data base.

### III. SCOPE

- A. The libraries to be involved include: The Texas State Library, Dallas Public Library, Houston Public Library, Waco-McLennan County Library, and Stephen F. Austin University Library. These libraries will provide bibliographic records of holdings, test the user acceptance of the catalog formats, and send one representative per institution to the Coordinating Board. The AMIGOS Bibliographic Council will input the data into machine-readable form, select the vendors, and perform the analysis.
- B. The geographic area impacted by the program includes:
  - 1. The local user base of the 5 participating libraries.
  - 2. The State of Texas (based on participation of the Texas State Library, access through OCLC of 37 Texas libraries, and the inexpensive availability of copies of the COM catalogs).
  - 3. The United States (based on input of bibliographic records of the Texana collections of participating libraries into the Ohio College Library Center's on-line catalog, which is utilized in 40 states).

C. The number of people having access to new service includes:

1. Participating libraries' patron base will have direct access to the use of the union catalog.
2. Ohio College Library Center member libraries' patron base will receive direct access to the union catalog through the interlibrary loan aspect of the OCLC cooperative cataloging system.
3. Documentation of the vendor selection, production specifics, and user acceptability of the microform catalogs will be disseminated as widely as possible to assist library planners throughout the state of Texas. The indirect benefit of this project is not calculable in user numbers.
4. The number of libraries which will have access to project documentation includes approximately 975, or all libraries in the state of Texas. (This number excludes elementary, junior, and senior high school libraries.)

E. The methods for publicizing the results of the program include:

1. Complete documentation will be provided to all participants.
2. Review documents will be submitted for publication to state and national professional journals. Complete documentation will be available to libraries upon request.
3. Review documents will also be distributed to members of the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council and the Ohio College Library Center through these organizations' memoranda and newsletters.

#### IV. ALTERNATIVES

A. The alternative to testing the viability of COM-produced catalogs is to obtain complete reports from libraries which have already accomplished the decision-making process, completed the vendor search and selection, and received and tested the product in house. Such documentation has not been made available to the library community. Reports in the literature cite the use of microfiche OR microfilm catalogs; no comparative test situation has been reported. Specific cost information, personnel

utilization, production procedures, and user acceptance studies based on staff acceptance have not been documented. This project presents an opportunity to document all phases of the production and use of COM catalogs from vendor selection to comparative use acceptance.

V. OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION

A. Quantitative objectives of the program:

1. To select vendors to produce a microfiche and a microfilm catalog from magnetic-tape formatted bibliographic records representing ten to twenty thousand Texana titles.
2. To input bibliographic records representing 4 Texas libraries' Texana collections on magnetic tape through the OCLC system. Tapes will be utilized to accomplish production of COM-catalogs listed above.
3. To test the dual COM-catalogs in the 4 participating libraries for 3 months of patron and staff usage.

B. Qualitative objectives of the program:

1. To develop input and edit procedures for building tape records using the OCLC system. Such procedures will accomodate libraries which do not have in-house access to the OCLC system.

The purpose is to make the production of microform catalogs available to small institutions which cannot afford full OCLC system usage.

2. To document the procedures established in vendor selection, data preparation, and usage of the COM catalogs in a test situation.
3. To evaluate the usefulness of the two catalog formats to librarians using the catalogs, including advantages and disadvantages and overall public acceptance of the formats.
4. To establish standardized cost analyses for use by librarians in selecting vendors and establishing procedures for creating COM catalogs from an external source.

C. Progress toward meeting program objectives will be measured by deadlines on attached time schedule being met. Measurable data will be collected at three stages:

1. Vendor applicants will be recorded; all responses to the bid will be recorded; final selection criteria will be recorded.
2. Processing statistics will be recorded; input preparation by library staff members will be

timed; actual input through the OCLC Model 100 Cathode Ray Tube terminal(s) will be timed; criteria for staff selection will be recorded.

3. User reactions will be solicited: library staff users will complete evaluation forms comparing the two microform catalogs; library users will be asked to complete evaluation forms and/or public services personnel will solicit verbal evaluation from users and record such comments.

All statistical data will be evaluated during the final stages of the project. Quantitative information will be compared in two ways: fiche preparation and utilization compared to film, and both forms of microform compared to card catalog preparation and utilization. Qualitative information (user reaction comments) will be analyzed by project participants.

D. Spin-off effects of this program include:

1. The projected use of the documentation by librarians to select and implement microform catalogs as a cost-and-time-saving feature of catalog preparation;

2. The availability of the union catalog on Texana for reference and interlibrary loan purposes among Texas libraries;
3. Input of Texana titles into the OCLC data base will facilitate information dissemination and nation-wide inter-library access.

#### VI. IMPLEMENTATION, BUDGET ALTERNATIVES

- A. Time frame for implementation of project: (This proposed schedule begins on the day funds are received by the Project Director.)

| <u>DAY</u> | <u>ACTIVITIES</u>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 0-30       | <p>Project Coordinating Board meets and develops procedures for input and evaluation of data</p> <p>Project Director selects clerical staff for data preparation and input</p> <p>Project Director prepares bid specifications for vendor recruitment</p> |
| 31-65      | <p>Participating libraries begin submitting bibliographic data to Project Director</p> <p>Bids received by vendors are reviewed by Coordinating Board</p> <p>Project staff begin inputting library records into the OCLC system</p>                       |
| 66-90      | <p>Microform production vendors selected</p> <p>Data preparation and input continue</p> <p>First quarterly report to Texas State Library</p>                                                                                                              |

DAY

ACTIVITIES

|         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 91-180  | Data preparation and input continue<br>Microform production begins<br>Second quarterly report to Texas State Library                                                                                             |
| 181-290 | Microform catalogs received from Vendors and installed in participating libraries<br>Data collection concerning use of the catalogs begins<br>Third quarterly report to Texas State Library                      |
| 291-360 | Reports submitted by each participating library on quality of product, user response, evaluation<br>Coordinating Board meets to review project<br>Documentation completion and submission to Texas State Library |

B. Budget (Level A)

| <u>Category of Expense</u>                            | <u>Funds from Project</u> | <u>Funds from Participants</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| I. <u>Personnel</u>                                   |                           |                                |
| Project Director @ 50% of annual salary               | \$ 3,934.00               | \$ 5,066.00                    |
| Coordinating Board @ 5% of annual salaries (combined) |                           | \$ 5,000.00                    |
| Clerical staff @ \$5.80 per hour for 2,000 hours      | 10,000.00                 | 1,600.00                       |
| Input preparation by participating libraries          | 2,000.00                  | 10,500.00                      |
| II. <u>Hardware and Data Preparation</u>              |                           |                                |
| 8 readers @ \$50.00 per month for 3 months            | 1,200.00                  |                                |
| Profile preparation                                   | 100.00                    |                                |
| Magnetic tape purchase                                | 360.00                    |                                |
| Microform production                                  | 5,000.00                  |                                |
| III. <u>Advisory Cost</u>                             |                           |                                |
| Travel to participating libraries, Board meetings     | 1,650.00                  |                                |
| IV. <u>Evaluation Cost</u>                            | 2,000.00                  |                                |
| V. <u>Documentation Preparation and Distribution</u>  | 3,000.00                  |                                |
| VI. <u>Audit</u>                                      | 500.00                    |                                |
| TOTALS                                                | \$29,744.00               | \$22,166.00                    |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST                                    | \$51,910.00               |                                |
| Request amount, level A                               | \$29,744.00               |                                |

Budget funding level:

The cost analysis above represents the lowest possible funding level required to accomplish the objectives of this project. Given the project time constraints of 12 months, and the urgent need by librarians to have this documentation available to satisfy planning needs, the project could be enhanced by supplying more personnel to complete cataloging data on the collections of the participating libraries. Increased personnel and production funds could provide for a larger test catalog and accomplish shorter production time with longer testing time. The union catalog would be more complete for all participating libraries.

Budget (Level B)

| <u>Category of Expense</u>                                       | <u>Funds from Project</u> | <u>Funds from Participants</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| I. <u>Personnel</u>                                              |                           |                                |
| Project Director @<br>50% of annual<br>salary                    | \$ 9,000.00               |                                |
| Coordinating Board<br>@ 5% of annual<br>salaries (com-<br>bined) |                           | \$ 5,000.00                    |
| Clerical staff @<br>\$5.80 per hour<br>for 3,000 hours           | 17,400.00                 |                                |
| Input preparation by<br>participating<br>libraries               | 4,000.00                  | 15,000.00                      |

| <u>Category of Expense</u>                           | <u>Funds from Project</u> | <u>Funds from Participants</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| II. <u>Hardware and Data Preparation</u>             |                           |                                |
| 8 readers @ \$50.00 per month for 6 months           | \$ 2,400.00               |                                |
| Profile preparation                                  | 100.00                    |                                |
| Magnetic tape purchase                               | 540.00                    |                                |
| Microform production                                 | 7,500.00                  |                                |
| III. <u>Advisory Cost</u>                            |                           |                                |
| Travel to participating libraries, Board meetings    | 2,000.00                  |                                |
| IV. <u>Evaluation Cost</u>                           | 2,000.00                  |                                |
| V. <u>Documentation Preparation and Distribution</u> | 3,000.00                  |                                |
| VI. <u>Audit</u>                                     | 150.00                    |                                |
| TOTALS                                               | \$47,910.00               | \$20,000.00                    |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST                                   | \$67,910.00               |                                |
| Request amount, Level B                              | \$47,910.00               |                                |

Since the purpose of the project is to document production and comparison of microform catalog formats, rather than produce an inclusive union catalog of Texana titles, Budget Level A represents minimum fund requirements to accomplish document preparation and distribution. Budget Level B funding would enhance the spin-off effects of the project; it would enhance the basic

objectives only by providing a longer testing time. Except for presenting further enhancements (such as extended library participation) the project does not lend itself to a third funding level requirement.

- C. \$15,000.00 in local monetary support will be involved in the program other than LSCA grant funds. This represents personnel costs (see Budget, Level A).
- D. Since evidence of institutional support is provided with this proposal, the only obstacle to implementation would be denial of funds.

## VII. PROJECT CONCEPTUALIZATION EVALUATION

- A. To the requestors' knowledge, this project does not interface with other existing programs. Although two university libraries are producing or procuring microfiche catalogs from OCLC-produced magnetic tapes (University of Texas at Dallas and University of Texas of the Permian Basin), complete procedural documentation has not been published, and no comparative test situation was reported.

Four libraries in Abilene (Abilene Public Library, Abilene Christian University, Hardin-Simmons University, and McMurry College) are initiating a project to purchase a COM-produced fiche catalog, but no statistical or use data are available.

- B. The participating libraries will test the use of two microform catalogs in large and medium-sized public libraries and a university library. Future impact of this project, however, lies in the use of program documentation by librarians to implement COM-produced card catalog alternatives in Texas libraries. Until such documentation is available, many libraries (especially smaller ones) will be constrained to maintain expensive card catalogs with no capability to investigate, on an experimental basis, less expensive alternatives. This request represents seed money which can present data on possible ways to save thousands of library processing dollars throughout the state.

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Name: Bonnie Juergens

Education

- 1975: Audited advanced course in library automation at the School of Library and Information Science, State University of New York at Albany: Philip Long, Instructor.
- 1973-74: Graduate courses in management, linguistics, and Russian bibliography while employed at Syracuse University and the University of Arizona.
- 1970-72: M.L.S., the School of Library Science, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.
- 1965-69: B.A., MacMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois.  
Major: Russian and East European Area Studies.

Experience

- AMIGOS Bibliographic Council 7/1/75 to Present. Library Liaison Officer.
- SUNY Central Administration 6/1/74 to 5/15/75. Assistant to Director for Library Services.
- Syracuse University Libraries, 8/1/73 to 5/30/74. Reference Librarian and Acting Chemistry Librarian.
- University of Arizona Libraries, 6/1/70 to 7/15/73. Reference - Catalog Librarian.

Affiliations

- American Library Association
- Information Science and Automation Division, Program Planning Committee.

Publications

- SUNY, "SUNY/OCLC Training Manual," 1974-75

APPENDIX III.

GUIDELINES FOR SELECTION OF MATERIAL  
FOR INPUT

TSL PROJECT - CONTRACT #39

General input guidelines include the following: monographic, language printed material. If record is too incomplete to format for OCLC requirements, flag for question and check with supervisor.

I. Non-monographic items:

- a. Do not include any serials titles (i.e., "open entries") even if the serial has ceased publication.
- b. Do not include single articles or issues of journals which have been treated monographically by the local library unless the following conditions apply:
  1. The separately-treated item is already in the data base.
  2. " is represented by LC copy.
  3. " was published separately, i.e., by a publisher other than the original serial inclusion.
  4. The separately-treated item is bibliographically complete and of particular historic/local interest (this is very subjective; when in doubt, seek assistance) or is very lengthy as a stand-alone item.
  5. The separately-treated item is represented by a local record which is complete with imprint, pagination, series note, and subject entries.

II. Government publications:

- a. Include any government publication which is monographic and is already in the data base.
- b. Include any government publication for which there is LC copy available.
- c. Levels of government publications:
  1. U.S. government: do not include local records of U.S. government publications, unless the publication was separately published by a private publisher.
  2. State government: do not include local records of state government publications, unless the publication was separately published by a private publisher.
  3. State constitutions: do not include copies of state constitutions unless they are already in the data base, privately published with significant historical/local interest (such as bound-in with other material, in Spanish, etc.) and very complete records available, or on LC copy.
  4. State and local laws, abstracts of land titles, etc.: do not include unless they are already in the data base, privately published with significant historical/local interest, and very complete records are available, or on LC copy.

---

Level of completeness required for input of monographic, language printed material: each record must contain a main entry (if applicable), title entry, imprint, and pagination. Imprint and pagination may be incomplete but some portion of each of these fields should be available.

STATISTICS procedures for TSL project:

1. Upon starting a new pack of cards, attach one of the following statistics forms to the front of the pack. Complete preliminary information before beginning to search the pack.
2. Jot down each title searched; each copy cataloging update; each record input. Retain slip with pack of cards throughout all usage.
3. If more than one person works on a pack of cards, use one slip per person.

|                                    |            |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| NAME _____                         | DATE _____ |
| no. of <u>cards</u> in pack _____  |            |
| no. of <u>titles</u> in pack _____ |            |
| SEARCHES                           |            |
|                                    |            |
|                                    |            |
|                                    |            |
| INPUTS (L.C. & LOCAL)              |            |
|                                    |            |
|                                    |            |
|                                    |            |
| COPY CAT. UPDATES                  |            |
|                                    |            |
|                                    |            |
|                                    |            |
| COMPLETION DATE                    |            |

## PROCEDURES - TSL PROJECT

### I. OVERALL, ABSOLUTE REMINDERS:

1. Always keep the cards in proper shelf-list order.
2. Always check out and in the pack from which you are working.  
Never check out more than one pack at a time unless cards are to be transported to a remote terminal site (special instructions)
3. Never mark on the cards EXCEPT in pencil, under the following conditions:
  - a. ✓ check mark, top margin: to indicate that the record has been tagged and input, i.e., the work is completed on this record.
  - b. ? ~~XXXX~~ ZZ question mark, OCLC#, initials, in top margin: to indicate that the record appears to match a specific OCLC record, but is questionable, i.e., the record needs to be reviewed by revisor.
  - c. ? /XX ZZ question mark, save number, initials, in top margin: to indicate that the record has been placed in save but is questionable, i.e., the record needs to be reviewed by revisor.
  - d. ? ZZ question mark and initials, in top margin: to indicate that the shelf-list record is questionable, i.e., the record needs to be reviewed by revisor.

ALWAYS flag cards under the above conditions with a yellow tag.

Retain the cards in their proper shelf-list order.

### II. COLOR CODES FOR TAGS (CLIPS) USED:

1. YELLOW -- question; refer to revisor as per above conditions.
2. BLUE -- needs to be tagged by project staff.
3. GREEN -- needs to be input by project staff.
4. PINK -- will be returned to participating libraries for decision/tagging/etc.
5. other colors -- special meanings will be assigned as needed; do not interfere with flagged cards unless the meaning is clear to you and you have been assigned to work on them.

PROCEDURES --- TSL PROJECT cont.

PRESEARCHING: (refer to Guidelines for Selection...)

1. Examine the card to make sure it is a monograph. If it is not a monograph, do not search for the title (leave card unmarked and go on to the next card).
2. If questions arise which preclude your marking an OCLC record number or save number, flag the card with a yellow tag, mark with question mark and initials in pencil in top margin, and go on to the next card.

SEARCHING:

1. Search by any knowledge numbers available (OCLC#, LCCN, ISBN...)
2. Search by author/title or title; if not available through the first search chosen, or if the first search elicits an extended search response, go to the remaining search codes available. If all other searches fail, go back to the extended search.
3. If no search inquiry produces a match, go on to the next card.

COPY CATALOGING:

1. Make sure the card matches the data-base record: match main entries, titles, publishers, and date of publication. If main entry does not match, but all other pertinent information does, change the main entry to match the one chosen by the participating library.

NOTE: We will be developing an "authority file" as the input project progresses. If the main entry does not match the OCLC-record entry, check the "authority file" to see if we have already established an entry. If we have not listed one, make an authority entry showing the library's choice. Include the entry from the OCLC record with a record number (if available), the library entry following the library notation, and the call #.

ALWAYS SHOW THE ENTRY WE USE AS THE FINAL ENTRY. Example:

*Daniel Price, Jr., Firm, Bookseller, Waco, Texas  
#959687*

*TSL: Price Daniel, Jr., Bookseller, Waco, Texas.*

*012.  
B865da*

## PROCEDURES -- TSL PROJECT cont.

## COPY CATALOGING, cont.

2. Complete the call number field (092 for DDC and 090 for LC).
3. Complete the 049 field according to specific library holding information.
4. Correct "typos" or obvious errors in the data base record.

Look for major discrepancies such as series treatment, added-entry treatment (especially if main entry was changed), lack of local subjects. This review will be cursory and should not take a lot of extra time once the terminal operator is proficient. If record is "close" and acceptably tagged, we will try to use it.

NOTE: Series fields can cause problems. In particular, if the series is to be traced, NEVER leave the entry with "Its" "His" "Her" replacing the main entry. Only 490 (traced or traced differently) should retain this verbiage in the series note. Any 8xx entries should be complete.

5. Put the record into SAVE and mark the save number on the card, top margin, in pencil OR  
UPDATE and SEND the record. Put a small checkmark in pencil in top margin of completed card. DO NOT USE UPDATE UNTIL YOU HAVE SPECIFICALLY BEEN INSTRUCTED TO DO SO.
6. Go on to next card.

## INPUT CATALOGING:

. From tagged worksheet:

1. Search for the record, using all search codes available. If a match is found, return to copy cataloging procedures. Also report this match to supervisor.
2. If a match is not found, call up a monograph workform.
3. Complete the workform, checking each field as you send it. If information on the worksheet seems questionable, verify the tagging and correct the errors. If you need to seek consultation or have any question at all about some portion of the record, flag the worksheet with yellow, mark question mark and initials, and go on to the next record. If the question is about one field only, or it seems time-effective to complete the record and put it into SAVE, mark the save number with the question mark and initials, and go on to next record. Always flag problem records with yellow.
4. After the complete record has been input, reformat and check your work.

PROCEDURES --- TSL PROJECT cont.

INPUT CATALOGING, cont.

5. Put the record into SAVE and mark the save number on the worksheet, top margin, in pencil OR UPDATE and SEND the record. (Put a small checkmark in pencil in top margin of completed card.) Put the date input and your initials on the paper worksheet. Mark the OCLC number on the paper worksheet. DO NOT USE UPDATE UNTIL YOU HAVE SPECIFICALLY BEEN INSTRUCTED TO DO SO.
6. Go on to next worksheet.

B. From shelf-list record:

1. Search for the record, using all search codes available. If a match is found, return to copy cataloging procedures. Also report this match to supervisor.
2. If a match is not found, call up a monograph workform.
3. Complete the workform, checking each field as you send it. If information on the worksheet seems questionable, verify the tagging and correct the errors. If you need to seek consultation or have any question at all about some portion of the record, flag the shelf-list card with yellow, mark question mark and initials, and go on to the next record. If the question is about one field only, or it seems time-effective to complete the record and put it into SAVE, mark the save number with the question mark and initials on the top margin of the shelf-list card. Flag with yellow. Go on to next record.
4. After the complete record has been input, reformat and check your work.
5. Put the record into SAVE and mark the save number on the card, top margin, in pencil OR UPDATE and SEND the record. Put a small checkmark in pencil in top margin of completed card. DO NOT USE UPDATE UNTIL YOU HAVE SPECIFICALLY BEEN INSTRUCTED TO DO SO.
6. Go on to next card.

LC# \_\_\_\_\_ dt tg \_\_\_\_\_ Name \_\_\_\_\_  
dt ip \_\_\_\_\_ Name \_\_\_\_\_

ave \_\_\_\_\_

NG \_\_\_\_\_ SCE \_\_\_\_\_ CTRY \_\_\_\_\_ DTYP \_\_\_\_\_

TES \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 050 \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 040 ~~#~~ c IKM 049 [ARC] IKMX

0 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

LC# \_\_\_\_\_ dt tg \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_  
dt ip \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_

save \_\_\_\_\_

NG \_\_\_\_\_ SCE \_\_\_\_\_ CTRY \_\_\_\_\_ DTYP \_\_\_\_\_

TES \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 050 \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 040 ~~#~~ c IKM 049 [ARC] IKMX

0 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

LC# \_\_\_\_\_ dt tg \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_  
dt ip \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_

save \_\_\_\_\_

NG \_\_\_\_\_ SCE \_\_\_\_\_ CTRY \_\_\_\_\_ DTYP \_\_\_\_\_

TES \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 050 \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_ 040 ~~#~~ c IKM 049 [ARC] IKMX

0 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

1 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 \_\_\_\_\_

OCLC# \_\_\_\_\_ dt tg \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_  
save \_\_\_\_\_ dt ip \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_  
LANG \_\_\_\_\_ SCE \_\_\_\_\_ CTRY \_\_\_\_\_ DTYP \_\_\_\_\_  
DATES \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
092 \_\_\_\_\_ 050 \_\_\_\_\_  
082 \_\_\_\_\_ 040 ~~#~~ c IKM 049 [ARC] IKMX  
010 \_\_\_\_\_

1 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 \_\_\_\_\_

OCLC# \_\_\_\_\_ dt tg \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_  
save \_\_\_\_\_ dt ip \_\_\_\_\_ name \_\_\_\_\_  
LANG \_\_\_\_\_ SCE \_\_\_\_\_ CTRY \_\_\_\_\_ DTYP \_\_\_\_\_  
DATES \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
092 \_\_\_\_\_ 050 \_\_\_\_\_  
082 \_\_\_\_\_ 040 ~~#~~ c IKM 049 [ARC] IKMX  
010 \_\_\_\_\_

|    |     |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | 260 | 300 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|    |     |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | 260 | 300 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|    |     |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | 260 | 300 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|    |     |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | 260 | 300 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|    |     |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25 | 260 | 300 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

28 September, 1976

TO: TSL Project Staff Members  
FROM: Bonnie Juergens, Project Director  
SUBJECT: Equipment malfunctions

If you are working at the terminal and have any hardware problems, please seek solutions in the following order:

1. BUSINESS HOURS (9:00 - 5:00 p.m.)

a. Bonnie Juergens intercom extension #24

If she will not be in the office during work hours for an extended time (full day or more), a schedule will be posted.

b. Jim Kennedy

If Bonnie is out of the office and Mr. Kennedy is available, seek his assistance. Betsey Edmondson, our Executive Secretary, will know if he is available.

c. TAGER

Call 231-4124 and ask for Don Sudbrink. Tell him the problem and follow what instructions he gives you. Always leave a note about the problem on the keyboard of the terminal so others won't try to use it. Include time, symptoms, and report from TAGER.

2. EVENINGS AND SATURDAYS

a. Bonnie Juergens

Try her home phone number if she is not in the office. 423-1496

b. OCLC

Call the toll-free number 1-800-848-0350. Ask for an engineer. He will ask you for the following information, which is posted with each terminal:

- serial number
- logical number
- line number

Tell him the problem and follow what instructions he gives you. Always leave a note about the problem on the keyboard of the terminal so others won't try to use it. Include time, symptoms, and report from OCLC.

CHECK THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS BEFORE CALLING ANYONE:

1. The terminal is properly plugged in. The cable is properly attached.
2. Any slave is properly connected in the chain. All terminals higher in rank (i.e., between the master and the malfunctioning slave) are properly connected and turned on.
3. All adjustments available on the back of the terminal are properly made. That is, CONTRAST and BRIGHT are turned up to the proper level.
4. The POWER light is one. The terminal is polling. (or, the terminal is not polling, but the other terminals are.

WHAT TO DO IF THE SYSTEM GOES DOWN DURING YOUR SCHEDULED TIME

1. Wait thirty minutes before determining that it will not be coming back up. During that thirty minutes, do tagging or other assigned work away from the terminal.
2. Make sure that all the terminals are down -- that your problem is not really a terminal problem.
3. After the thirty minutes of waiting (hoping!) time, leave me a note about the status of the system and the status of your work load, and leave. If I am in the office, notify me in person.
4. If you would rather work out your scheduled time, and there is other (non-terminal) work to do, do that. But be sure to leave me a status report in writing.

APPENDIX IV.

## FINAL REPORT

## APPENDIX D

TSL PROJECT Contract # 39

STATISTICS for the week ending 12 Feb, 1977

| LIBRARY              |   | NUMBER OF<br>CARDS | NUMBER OF<br>TITLES | NUMBER OF<br>SEARCHES | NUMBER OF<br>INPUTS | C.CAT.<br>UPDATES         | NUMBER OF<br>RETURNS | NOT<br>APPLICABLE | OVERLAP |
|----------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------|
| TSL                  | a | 12,048             | 10,570              | 20,423                | 2,923               | 3,702                     | 973                  | 2,972             | 61      |
|                      | b |                    |                     |                       |                     |                           |                      |                   |         |
|                      | c | 12,048             | 10,570              | 20,423                | 2,923               | 3,702                     | 973                  | 2,972             | 61      |
| WACO                 | a | 3,632              | 3,040               | 4,230                 | 286                 | 1,850                     | 304                  | 600               | 294     |
|                      | b |                    |                     |                       |                     |                           |                      |                   |         |
|                      | c | 3,632              | 3,040               | 4,230                 | 286                 | 1,850                     | 304                  | 600               | 294     |
| S.F.                 | a | 2,539              | 1,948               | 3,598                 | 166                 | 1,212                     |                      | 570               | 337     |
| AUSTIN               | b |                    | 52                  | 44                    | 19                  | 7                         |                      | 26                | 6       |
|                      | c | 2,539              | 2,000               | 3,642                 | 185                 | 1,219                     |                      | 596               | 343     |
| DALLAS               | a |                    | 9,842               | 13,630                | 174                 | 5,661                     |                      |                   | 335     |
|                      | b |                    |                     | 799                   | 13                  | 282                       |                      | 3,712             | 64      |
|                      | c |                    | 9,842               | 14,429                | 187                 | 5,943                     |                      | 3,712             | 300     |
| HOUSTON              | a | 9,612              | 9,123               | 16,235                | 1,060               | 4,690                     |                      | 3,273             | 1,145   |
|                      | b |                    | 257                 | 302                   | 119                 | 38                        |                      | 100               | 21      |
|                      | c | 9,612              | 9,380               | 16,537                | 1,179               | 4,728                     |                      | 3,473             | 1,166   |
| TOTALS               |   |                    |                     |                       |                     |                           |                      |                   |         |
| a=prior cumulation   |   |                    | 34,523              | 58,116                | 4,609               | 17,115                    | 1,277                | 7,515             | 2,172   |
| b=current week       |   |                    | 309                 | 1,145                 | 151                 | 327                       |                      | 3,838             | 91      |
| c=current cumulation |   |                    | 34,832              | 59,261                | 4,760               | 17,442                    | 1,277                | 11,353            | 2,263   |
| 79                   |   |                    |                     |                       |                     | 22,202 TOTAL TITLES USAGE |                      |                   | 80      |

## LSCA TITLE THREE TSL CONTRACT # 39

## APPENDIX E

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TITLES MANIPULATED PER LIBRARY

to 12 February, 1977

| LIBRARY        | NUMBER<br>TITLES | INPUTS<br>NUMBER % | COP. CAT.<br>NUMBER % | RETURNS<br>NUMBER % | NOT<br>APPLICABLE<br>NUMBER % | OVERLAP<br>NUMBER % | SEARCHES<br>TOTAL PER TITL |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| TEXAS ST. LIBY | 10,570           | 2,923 27.65        | 3,702 35.02           | 973 9.21            | 2,972 28.12                   | 61 .5771            | 20,423 1.93                |
| WACO           | 3,040            | 286 9.40           | 1,850 60.86           | 304 10              | 600 19.74                     | 294 9.67            | 4,230 1.39                 |
| SFA            | 2,000            | 185 9.25           | 1,219 60.95           | -----               | 596 29.80                     | 343 17.15           | 3,642 1.82                 |
| DALLAS         | 9,842            | 187 1.90           | 5,943 60.38           | -----               | 3,712 37.72                   | 399 4.05            | 14,429 1.47                |
| HOUSTON        | 9,390            | 1,179 12.57        | 4,728 50.41           | -----               | 3,473 37.03                   | 1,166 12.43         | 16,537 1.76                |
| TOTAL          | 34,832           | 4,760 13.67        | 17,442 50.07          | 1,277 03.67         | 11,353 32.59                  | 2,263 6.49          | 59,261 1.70                |

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF EACH CATEGORY OF EFFECTIVE AND APPLICABLE TITLES PER LIBRARY:

|                |        |             |              |             |
|----------------|--------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| TEXAS ST. LIBY | 6,625  | 2,923 44.12 | 3,702 55.88  | 61 00.92    |
| WACO           | 2,136  | 286 13.39   | 1,850 86.61  | 294 13.76   |
| SFA            | 1,404  | 185 13.18   | 1,219 86.82  | 343 24.43   |
| DALLAS         | 6,130  | 187 03.05   | 5,943 96.95  | 399 06.51   |
| HOUSTON        | 5,907  | 1,179 19.96 | 4,728 80.04  | 1,166 19.74 |
| TOTAL          | 22,202 | 4,760 21.44 | 17,442 78.56 | 2,263 10.19 |

LSA TITLE III  
Contract Number 39  
SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

———— = current projections  
----- = proposal projections

Profile preparation  
Cat. copy receipt in progress  
Central staff selected, trained, in  
production on input & edit  
Cat. copy processed  
Tape service in process  
Request for Proposal prepared &  
sent to bidders  
Vendor selected for microform  
production  
Tapes received; microform produced  
Readers solicited, rec'd, installed  
Catalogs rec'd for edit  
Completed catalogs rec'd, installed  
Staff trained for cat. use & data  
gathering  
Catalogs tested  
  
Use data rec'd and analyzed  
Final reports prepared  
Public dissemination reports complete  
Quarterly reports to TSL

1976  
JULY

AUG

SEPT

OCT

NOV

DEC

1977  
JAN

FEB

MAR

APR

MAY

JUNE

JULY

AUG

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX V.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
Texas State Library Contract Number 39  
Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Libraries?

BACKGROUND

The AMIGOS Bibliographic Council has been awarded a grant from the Texas State Library to test the viability of computer-output-microform catalogs as a replacement for card catalogs in five Texas libraries. Those libraries include the Texana collections from: Dallas Public Library, Houston Public Library, Stephen F. Austin University Library, Texas State Library, and Waco-McLennan County Library. Union catalogs in both microfiche and microfilm will be tested in patron-use situations for three months and the results of the development and testing of the COM catalogs will be distributed to interested libraries in Texas and throughout the library community of the United States.

AMIGOS is seeking a computer-output-microform vendor to produce the catalogs for this landmark study. A strong possibility exists that a number of libraries in the State of Texas and the greater Southwest will utilize the specifications developed by this project, as well as the vendor selected, in future COM catalog development.

Machine-readable cataloging data for the catalog production will be provided by AMIGOS.

SCOPE

Ten to fifteen thousand (10,000 - 15,000) titles will form the computer-output-microform union catalog. For the union catalog, each entry will contain full bibliographic information and complete tracings as well as coded location. Cross-references may be required to normalize entries. For a given bibliographic record, multiple locations will exist. It is expected that the machine-readable data will be sorted, manipulated, and merged in order to put the data into a form from which COM fiche and film catalogs can be produced. At least fourteen (14) copies of each form (microfiche and microfilm) of the union catalog will be supplied to AMIGOS. In addition, user demand may require a larger number of union catalog copies to be supplied.

CONDITIONS OF BIDDING

1. All bids must be written in ink or by typewriter, show the full name of firm bidding, and be manually signed by an officer of the company.

2. Bids should show net unit prices and net total.
3. Bidders must use OCLC tapes and submit samples.
4. The Contractor assumes full responsibility for the use of patented appliances, products, or processes, and shall pay all royalties and charges which are legal and equitable.
5. Bids must be received by 3 January, 1977.

#### DATA SUPPLIED BY AMIGOS

The magnetic tapes supplied to the vendor by the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council will have the following characteristics:

1. Tapes will contain bibliographic records in accordance with the Library of Congress' MARC II format for monographs.
2. Tapes will be supplied in monthly and/or quarterly supplements. Records will be transferred to machine-readable form using the Ohio College Library Center's on-line cataloging system; the tapes will be received from OCLC and shipped to vendor upon receipt by AMIGOS. The tapes will be returned to the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council after being used for COM production by vendor.
3. Data on the magnetic tapes are not cumulative from one record to the next for records with the same OCLC-system identifying number. Thus, duplicate records will exist in the magnetic tapes and provision for elimination of duplicate records must be specified in bidders' proposals.
4. Tapes may contain a number of records not to be utilized for the COM catalog; records in this category will be identified from the 049 field and will be omitted from all catalog-production activity by vendor.
5. Records on the magnetic tapes are arranged in chronological order by date of entry/use of the OCLC-system record.
6. Tapes are: 9 track  
1600 characters per inch  
unblocked variable length records  
tape labels are ANSI standard
7. Only ASCII code is on the tapes.

#### FORMAT

1. The catalogs will be divided three (3) ways: author, title, and subject. Each entry will contain full bibliographic data.

- a. Author entries will include data from the following fields:  
100, 110, 111, 130, 400, 410, 411, 700, 710, 711, 730, 800, 810, 811.
  - b. Title entries will include data from the following fields:  
240, 245 subfield a, 440, 740, 840.
  - c. Subject entries will include data from the following fields:  
600, 610, 611, 630, 650, 651, 690, 691.
2. The bibliographic data contained in a record will follow "standard" bibliographic format for catalog cards. Since a number of formats are considered "standard" and acceptable, vendor must demonstrate that the proposed format will fall within the following guidelines:
- a. Main entry for each record must be highlighted (by indention, boldface, or upper case letters) for all appropriate data from the main entry.
  - b. The title statement must include title, subtitle, remainder of title page transcription, edition statement, and imprint for all records which contain the above data.
  - c. Collation statement should be separated from the title statement.
  - d. Notes should be separated from the collation and multiple notes should be separated from each other.
  - e. Tracings should be separated from the body of bibliographic record and supplied with appropriate numbering (i.e., Arabic sequential numbering for subject entries and Roman sequential numbering for other added entries.)
  - f. Call numbers:
    1. Multiple records of an individual institution or the combined institutions will not be edited out but will be shown as duplicate location symbols with call number (or call numbers if there is a variation in the call numbers). The record with the latest entry date will be retained; the one record retained will contain holding symbols and/or call numbers for all libraries holding this title. Bidder must describe procedures for effecting this consolidation.
    2. For each location, the order of precedence for call numbers will be as follows:

- a. Dallas Public Library: 099, 092
  - b. Houston Public Library: 099, 092
  - c. Stephen F. Austin University Library: 099, 090, 050
  - d. Texas State Library: 099, 092
  - e. Waco-McLennan County Library: 099, 092
3. Display format for holdings symbols and call numbers will be:

|                                       |             |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Holding library name<br>(abbreviated) | Call number |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|

Example:

|             |                 |
|-------------|-----------------|
| Texas S. L. | ARC 317.54 H59  |
| Waco-McL.   | R T 317.599 H72 |

The holding library identifying information will be supplied through a code in the 049 field. Contractor will be expected to provide automatic translation from the holding library four-character symbol to the abbreviated form of the library name to be listed with the call number.

If the record contains "stamp" or location information bracketed in the 049 field, that information will be displayed with the call number.

In the example above, the components were extracted from the following parts of the record:

Texas S. L. came from the four-character holding library symbol in the 049 field.  
ARC came from bracketed data in the 049 field.  
317.54 H59 came from the 092 field.

Waco-McL. came from the four-character holding library symbol in the 049 field.  
R came from bracketed data in the 049 field.  
T came from bracketed data in the 049 field.  
317.599 H72 came from the 092 field.

The translation schedule for holding library symbol to holding library abbreviation is as follows:

| <u>LIBRARY</u>                          | <u>049 field<br/>4-char. symbol</u> | <u>Display<br/>abbreviation</u> |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dallas Public Library                   | JZA7                                | Dallas P.L.                     |
| Houston Public Library                  | TXNM                                | Houston P.L.                    |
| Stephen F. Austin University<br>Library | TXKM                                | S.F.A. Univ.L.                  |
| Texas State Library                     | IKMX                                | Texas S.L.                      |
| Waco-McLennan County Library            | TXWZ                                | Waco-McL.                       |

4. All call number/stamp/and holdings information will display after the bibliographic data.
- g. The Library of Congress Card Number (LCCN) will display on the bottom line right justified, if it is available from the 010 field of the record. The OCLC system number will display on the bottom line, left justified, of every record. (The OCLC number will be obtained from the 001, fixed field portion of each tape record.)
- h. A number of fields defined in the MARC II format require "print constants" or special symbols to be supplied automatically based on the tag and/or subfield code utilized. Bidders should specify how these requirements will be fulfilled.

Example:

Tape record contains: 505b0b6b\$al.bTo the light  
house;b2.bLetters.

Microform display must show: CONTENTS: 1. To the light  
house; 2. Letters.

- i. Authority control: Format of cross-reference listings must be described by bidder. If Library of Congress authority file on tape is to be utilized, describe this use.
  - j. Specify whether proportional or nonproportional spacing is used.
  - k. Specify filing rules (sort) utilized.
3. Reduction: Reduction ratio must be such that the final product, when read through a reader utilizing a 48x lens, will present a screen image of 9-11 point "type" size.
    - a. Microfiche:
      1. The master and copies will conform to industry standards and copies will be readable by standard, readily available readers.
      2. Fiche headings will be readable without magnification and will conform to the following copy examples:

TEXANA UNION AUTHOR CATALOG from AAAAA  
to MAAAA

TEXANA UNION TITLE CATALOG from AAAAA to  
MAAAA

TEXANA UNION SUBJECT CATALOG from AAAAA  
TO MAAAA

Alphabetic description of the fiche content will be taken from the first entry and the last entry on each fiche.

3. Indexing will be provided at the top or bottom of each column for the entries in that column.

b. Microfilm:

1. The master and copies will conform to industry standards and copies will be readable by the ROM 3 microfilm reader. Magnification rate on the ROM 3 reader is 39x, although this reader accepts film reduction ratios 42x to 59x.
2. The three-way divided catalog containing author/title/subject portions will be contained on one continuous film.
3. Index data will be supplied for the ROM 3 readers.

PRODUCT DELIVERY

1. The magnetic tapes will be supplied to vendor between 15 January and 15 February, 1977. Completed microform catalogs will be produced by vendor from tapes and supplied to AMIGOS four (4) to six (6) weeks after receipt of tapes.
2. Penalty for delinquency in meeting the required delivery schedule will be computed at a rate of 10% of the total contract price per calendar week of delinquency.
3. Vendor should state whether any of the aforementioned requirements cannot be provided.

PRICING SCHEDULE

All bids will be submitted on a per-unit (per master record) price basis. The purchase order issued will be for an estimated dollar value with invoicing to be made on the basis of the actual number of records manipulated and included in the final product.

Prices should be submitted in the following categories, with the following conditions to apply:

Conditions:

1. A master record is defined as the net occurrence after all records containing the same OCLC-system identifying number are combined.
2. Vendor may not use the AMIGOS bibliographic data for any other purpose without the written consent of AMIGOS.

**Categories:**

1. OCLC input (per master record);
2. Generation of COM tape
3. Generation of master fiche for author, title, subject and/or shelf list catalogs (per master record)
4. Generation of master film for author, title, subject and/or shelf list catalogs (per master record)
5. Microfiche catalog (per fiche copy)
6. Microfilm catalog (per film foot OR per copy)
7. Record changes and/or deletes
8. Authority cross-reference input

The AMIGOS Bibliographic Council reserves the right to reject any and/or all bids and to waive defects in either the bid specifications or in any bid actually received, and to negotiate minor differences.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL  
AMIGOS Bibliographic Council  
Texas State Library Contract Number 39  
Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Libraries?

| <u>PRICING SCHEDULE</u>                                                                             | <u>UNIT PRICE</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. OCLC input (per master record)                                                                   | _____             |
| 2. Generation of COM tape                                                                           | _____             |
| 3. Generation of master fiche for author, title, subject and/or shelf list cat. (per master record) | _____             |
| 4. Generation of master film for author, title, subject and/or shelf list cat. (per master record)  | _____             |
| 5. Microfiche catalog (per fiche copy)                                                              | _____             |
| 6. Microfilm catalog (per film foot OR per copy)                                                    | _____             |
| 7. Record changes and/or deletes                                                                    | _____             |
| 8. Authority cross-reference input                                                                  | _____             |
| 9. Any additional charges (must be specified)                                                       | _____             |
| TOTAL PRICE                                                                                         | _____             |

Bids must be received by 3 January, 1977.

Bidder must submit sample of COM film and/or fiche and indicate whether the input was from OCLC tapes. Attached \_\_\_\_\_ (please check here if attached)

Describe hardware/software operating procedures designed to detect and correct errors (quality control procedures). Attached \_\_\_\_\_ (please check here if attached)

Authority control description attached \_\_\_\_\_ (please check here if attached)

COMPANY \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_  
TITLE \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Cite current and previous list of at least three customers; indicate OCLC-tape inputs:

1. Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address, phone \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address, phone \_\_\_\_\_
3. Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address, phone \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX VI.

# FICHE SAMPLES: PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

{ = INFORMATION TREATED AS SEPARATE ENTITIES; separated from other data by line breaks or indentation.

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AUTOGRAPHICS  | Fiche sample: from BALLOTS tape, not OCLC.<br>No type match; fiche sheets contain no frames, just columns of records.                                                                                                             | Record format: {main entry (upper case, boldface)<br>{ title, ed. stmt, imprint.<br>{ collation.<br>{ series or notes.<br>{ tracings, system number.<br>{ LCCN, LC call #, DDC call #. |
| BLACKWELL     | Fiche sample: from OCLC tape records.<br>Matches "type 5" but sheets & frames larger.<br>42x; 208 frames; 3 columns per frame; 8-15 records per frame.                                                                            | Record format: {main entry (boldface)<br>{ title, ed. stmt., imprint,<br>{ collation, LC call #, DDC call #.<br>{ control nos. & cat. source code.                                     |
| BRODART       | Fiche sample: from OCLC tape records.<br>Matches "type 7" but sheets & frames smaller.<br>48x; 270 frames per sheet; 3 columns per frame; 12-15 records per frame. index at end of sheet. frames lettered & numbered: "GRID B 17" | Record format: {main entry (boldface)<br>{ title, ed. stmt., imprint,<br>{ collation.<br>{ notes.<br>{ tracings.<br>{ call number, holdings symbol.                                    |
| SCIENCE PRESS | Fiche sample: NOT from OCLC.<br>Matches "type 7" but sheets & frames smaller.<br>48x; 270 frames per sheet; 2 columns per frame; 48 records per frame.                                                                            | Record format: {main entry, title, imprint.<br>{ call no., holdings symbol in ( ).<br><br>VERY ABBREVIATED RECORDS.                                                                    |

| BIDDER                              | OCLC INPUT                           | Generation<br>of<br>COM TAPE                                          | Generation<br>of<br>MST FICHE      | Generation<br>of<br>MST FILM | COPIES<br>of<br>FICHE CAT                               | COPIES<br>of<br>FILM CAT                                  | RECORD<br>CHANGES                                                                                               | AUTHORITY                                                           | OTHER    | TOTAL                  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|
|                                     | 1                                    | 2                                                                     | 3                                  | 4                            | 5                                                       | 6                                                         | 7                                                                                                               | 8                                                                   | 9        |                        |
| AUTOGRAPHICS,<br>Inc.               | .10/record<br>x 14,000 =<br>1,400.00 | 00                                                                    | .025/record<br>350.00              | .025/record<br>350.00        | .30/sheet<br>assume 11 shts<br>3.30/copy<br>x14=46.20   | .06/foot<br>assume 70 ft<br>4.20/copy<br>x14=58.80        | .25/field<br>x 5% (700)<br>175.00                                                                               | .35/entry<br>x 10% (1400)<br>490.00                                 | 00       | \$2,870                |
| BLACKWELL<br>NORTH AMERICA,<br>Inc. | 00                                   | .102/record<br>(.051/record/<br>double run,<br>x 14,000 =<br>1,428.00 | 00                                 | .0138/record<br>194.00       | .12/sheet<br>assume 25 shts<br>3.00/copy<br>x14=42.00   | .05/foot<br>assume 125ft<br>6.25/copy<br>x14=87.50        | .20/field<br>x 5% (700)<br>140.00                                                                               | 1. .28 @ 100%<br>= 3,920.00<br>2. .20 @ 10%<br>+ 150.00<br>= 430.00 | 00       | 1. \$5,811<br>2. 2,321 |
| BRODART,<br>Inc.                    | .05/record<br>x 14,000 =<br>700.00   | 00                                                                    | 00                                 | 00                           | .13/sheet<br>assume 25 shts<br>3.25/copy<br>x14=45.50   | .05/foot<br>assume 100 ft<br>5.00/copy<br>x14=70.00       | 00                                                                                                              | 600.00                                                              | 00       | \$1,415                |
| SCIENCE PRESS                       | 00                                   | .035/record<br>x 14,000 =<br>490.00                                   | .0046/record<br>64.00              | .0046/record<br>64.00        | 2.00/copy<br>x 14 =<br>28.00                            | 3.75/copy<br>x 14 =<br>53.00                              | .15/record for corrections &<br>authority entries. assume<br>20% (2800) = 420.00 + 490.00<br>for rerun = 910.00 |                                                                     | 1,559.00 | \$ 3,168               |
| XEROX --<br>R.R. BOWKER             | .05/record<br>x 14,000 =<br>700.00   | 100.00 min.<br>(assume double)<br>200.00                              | .005/record<br>x 14,000 =<br>70.00 | .005/record<br>70.00         | .18/sheet<br>assume 25 shts<br>4.50/copy<br>x14 = 63.00 | .099/foot<br>assume 220 ft<br>21.78/copy<br>x 14 = 304.92 | .04/change<br>x 10% (1400)<br>56.00                                                                             | .075/entry<br>100%<br>1,050.00                                      | 00       | \$2,514.               |

CANNOT PROVIDE PRODUCT BEFORE 31 MAY, 1977.

APPENDIX VII.

Thank you for taking a few moments to help us evaluate our microform catalogs. Your comments will help us determine how best we can help you and other users.

1. First of all, which kind of catalog did you use today?
    - ☐ 1) Microfiche (the one with sheets of film you inserted in the reader)
    - ☐ 2) Microfilm
  2. Were you using the catalog to look for a particular author, a particular title or were you looking for a subject?
    - ☐ 1) Looking for a specific author(s)
    - ☐ 2) Looking for a specific title(s)
    - ☐ 3) Looking for material on a subject(s)
    - ☐ 4) Looking for some combination of author, title, and/or subject
    - ☐ 5) Other (Please explain) \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Did you feel that you were able to use the catalog to determine if the material you wanted was in the library?
    - ☐ 1) Yes, I located the material needed and it was in the library.
    - ☐ 2) Yes, I was able to determine the material was not in the library.
    - ☐ 3) No, I could not determine from the catalog the information needed.
    - ☐ 4) Other (Please explain) \_\_\_\_\_
- If your answer to No.3 was No ...
4. Could you please tell me why you felt the catalog could not be used?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Based on your experiences, would you please rate (by circling your choice) the usability of the catalog you have used.

|    | If you used the MICROFICHE                        | Very Easy | Easy | Don't Know | Difficult | Impossible |
|----|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|------------|-----------|------------|
| 5. | I found locating the correct sheet of fiche to be | 1         | 2    | 0          | 3         | 4          |
| 6. | I found inserting the fiche to be                 | 1         | 2    | 0          | 3         | 4          |
| 7. | I found using the index to be                     | 1         | 2    | 0          | 3         | 4          |
| 8. | I found the film image to be                      | 1         | 2    | 0          | 3         | 4          |
| 9. | I found the overall use of the microfiche to be   | 1         | 2    | 0          | 3         | 4          |

If you used the MICROFILM

|                                               |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. I found locating the correct entry to be  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. I found using the index to be             | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. I found the film image to be              | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. I found the overall use of the film to be | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 |

14. Have you at any time used both the microfilm and microfiche catalogs?

- ☐ 1) Yes
- ☐ 2) No

15. If you answered yes to Question 14, would you prefer to use the microfilm or microfiche catalogs?

☐ 1) Microfilm  
☐ 2) Microfiche  
☐ 3) No preference

16. If your answer to Question 15 was 1 or 2, would you please tell me why you prefer that type of catalog?

---

---

---

In order to determine if choices on type of catalogs should be made based on type of patrons who use the catalog, we would like to ask a few questions about you.

17. How often do you use the library?

☐ 1) one or more times per week  
☐ 2) one to four times per month  
☐ 3) one to 12 times per year  
☐ 4) less than once per year  
☐ 5) Other (Please explain) \_\_\_\_\_

18. Have you used microform materials previously?

☐ 1) frequently  
☐ 2) occasionally  
☐ 3) only once or twice  
☐ 4) no, this is my first time

19. What was the last grade in school you completed?

☐ 1) Elementary school  
☐ 2) High school  
☐ 3) Some college  
☐ 4) College graduate  
☐ 5) Post graduate work

20. Could you please tell me which of the following age groups include yours.

☐ 1) less than 14 years  
☐ 2) 14 to 20 yrs. of age  
☐ 3) 21 to 35 yrs. of age  
☐ 4) 36 to 50 yrs. of age  
☐ 5) over 50 yrs. of age

21. Do you have any other comments or suggestions you would like to make about the catalog(s)?

---

---

---

---

---

22. May we contact you for further comments? If so, please provide your name and telephone number:

---

---

APPENDIX VIII.

AMIGOS  
BIBLIOGRAPHIC COUNCIL

TSL PROJECT  
INTERVIEWERS MANUAL

June, 1977

## INTRODUCTION

As one of the persons designated to conduct the surveys for the AMIGOS TSL Project, you are one of the most important links in a careful study to ascertain public acceptance of microfiche catalogs.

As a professional in the Library field, you are probably aware of the dichotomous feelings concerning the use of microform catalogs. You may even have strong feelings yourself concerning the appropriateness and applications of this new catalog form. Most people in the profession do have some feelings on this subject.

If we are to know how our users really feel about the different forms of catalogs it is imperative that the study be conducted with as little bias as possible.

This manual is an attempt to help those persons who may be professional librarians by neophyte interviews to know how to conduct public opinion survey field work. Some of these instructions may seem elementary, repetitive or even impossible, but are extremely important if we as librarians are to make sure that we do not allow myopia to predicate our decisions but rather allow our patrons to help us realize how best to serve them.

I hope you will read these instructions carefully and that the accuracy of your work is predicated on how well these instructions are followed.

Here, in checklist form, are essentials of good interviewing. The brevity with which the points are stated belies the lengthy experience distilled therein. Student interviewers never fail to remark later how valuable were the instructions they thought belabored in training. While reading through the following guides, suppose that you are about to go out on your first interviewing assignment.

Checklist 1:  
Interviewer's Code

You must be:

1. Completely honest in your work.
2. Reliable and conscientious.
3. Utterly objective in your manner of asking questions.
4. Faithful and neutral in recording answers.
5. Willing to write answers fully and legibly.
6. Interested in people; understanding.
7. Able to inspire people's confidence and put them at ease.

Be sure to:

1. Study all questions until you know what they mean and are familiar enough with them so you can really ask the questions instead of blindly reading them.
2. Interview yourself by answering each question thoughtfully. Then interview someone else, for practice. Of course, these interviews are not counted as part of the assigned interviews you turn in.
3. Re-read your instructions between interviews - you may pick up points you missed before or correct errors you have begun to make.

Your attitude should be:

1. NEUTRAL

As an interviewer, you merely soak up information like a sponge without giving any of it back. Your job is to record that information, regardless whether you think it good, bad, indifferent, boring, or exciting. This may be particularly difficult because you are involved in the Library.

Don't - by word, action, or gesture - indicate surprise, pleasure, or disapproval at any answer. Even a slight grimace or gasp will cue a respondent that you have reacted to his answer.

Don't attempt to influence responses in any way. The truth is all that really counts - what the person really thinks or feels about the subject. Thus:

- a. Never suggest an answer. And don't give your own opinions. This is a survey of respondents' feelings, not yours.
- b. For the same reason - so the response will not be influenced in any way - you must ask the questions exactly as they are worded and in the same order every time. Each interview must be done the same way, to assure uniform and reliable results.
- c. If the respondent doesn't understand a question, repeat it exactly as written rather than explain it. Otherwise you're sure to give away yourself or the answer you may be expecting. Repeat the

question only twice, then go on if the person still does not understand it.

## 2. IMPARTIAL

Whatever you may think of an individual or his opinion, keep it to yourself. Each interview you are asked to get, and therefore each person you speak to, is equally important.

You should be adaptable to anyone and gracious to all. Each person you approach poses different problems requiring different techniques. The important thing is to inspire the confidence of every respondent regardless of sex, age, residence, income, political affiliation or whatever.

## 3. CASUAL

You are not a spy out on a secret mission. If you pursue your assignment too earnestly, too grimly, the respondent is forced to the defensive. He won't tell you what he honestly thinks.

You are not subjecting the individual to the third degree. This is not in any sense a quiz or intelligence test. He'll tell nothing if he thinks you're watching for errors or conducting an examination. Don't make him think it's a matter of life and death. Take it easy. Approach the interview pleasurable and let the respondent enjoy it, too. Assume that he wants to express his opinion and wants to be interviewed. You merely are giving him the chance to express himself on matters that may be important to him.

#### 4. CONVERSATIONAL

Use an informal manner of speaking, natural to you, and aimed at putting the individual at ease. Know the questions so well that you never sound as though you're reading them formally.

Although you are conversational, never lose control of the interview. From the moment the correct respondent appears at the door, talk him through the introduction and right into the body of the questionnaire before he reacts negatively.

Be ready with stock answers to handle interruptions or objections. Give these answers in an offhand tone of voice as though you've heard the objection a hundred times, and proceed with the questions.

#### 5. FRIENDLY

A major objective is to put the respondent at ease. If he isn't relaxed, you can't make him talk. The burden of ignorance has to be lifted from the respondent's shoulders - that is, he must not be made to feel ashamed of his lack of information. Your attitude, therefore, must be sympathetic and understanding. Emphasize that there are no correct answers. Rather, he must be made to realize that what he thinks really is what counts.

If the respondent is forced to answer, "I don't know," to a series of information questions, he may become embarrassed and start grasping for any other answers. Good question wording will provide alternatives like "...or haven't you had

a chance to read about that?" A sympathetic interviewer will make these alternatives seem like natural parts of the question instead of making them sound like, "You don't know that either?" or something equally demoralizing.

Again, if the individual seems confused by a question, even after repetition, record whatever answer is given. Or if the respondent objects to a question, you are allowed to side with him only to the extent that you say with a smile, "I don't know why, but that's the way my office has the question worded."

Remember: the object of the survey is to get the honest, uninfluenced opinion of each individual interviewed. You are merely the medium through which the opinion is conveyed. Nothing of you should be in the interview results.

The following checklist tersely summarizes homely but helpful experience accumulated about interviewing.

Checklist 2:  
Interviewing Tactics

1. Usually the first meaningful reaction to a question is the important or true one. Don't record any changes in an answer to a past question if you already have gone on to other items. Note at the point he wishes to go back that the respondent now indicates he would say something else.
2. But don't record a "don't know" answer too quickly. People say, "I don't know" when stalling for time to arrange their thoughts. The phrase merely may be an introduction to a

meaningful comments, so give the respondent a little time to think.

3. When straight "Yes" and "No" answers are accompanied by qualifications such as "Yes, if..." or "Yes, but not..." record the comments, regardless of whether space has been provided for them. Later they may reveal something important about the question which was not anticipated.
4. Record comments or remarks just as they are given. The exact words people use to describe their feelings are important. Include the flavor of language used, rather than summarize the comments in your own words. Of course, if the comment is lengthy and you cannot write down every word, make notes that give the sense and the style of the comment. Use abbreviations that are understandable, so in checking over the interview you can fill in the content of the answer.
5. Get specific comments, not vague, meaningless generalities like "I like it because it's good" or "because it's interesting" or "It's okay." Ask "Why?" in such cases.
6. Keep talking as you write. Ask the second question as you record the response to the first. Start the respondent thinking about a question. If you let a silence grow, he has more opportunities to become distracted, bored, resentful, or may even change his mind. Keep the pencil and notebook as inconspicuous as possible. Keep eye contact with the respondent, and do the writing unobtrusively. This is one key to the informal atmosphere essential to successful interviews.

7. Focus the respondent's attention on the questions. If he wants to talk about his new car of the New Frontier, politely but firmly steer him back to the questions. Smile and say, "That's interesting...now what would you say about this question?"
8. Record all the answers yourself; never allow the respondent to do so. Under no circumstances should he see the questions, for if he knows what is coming he is already contriving an answer. Exception: Sometimes there is a separate section in the questionnaire that the respondent is asked to fill out.
9. Get all the information you are asked to get. That means, ask every question and record every answer - in the correct place. A questionnaire with serious omissions or errors may have to be discarded. The ordinary analyst cannot guess answers. Therefore, check over the questionnaire at the end of each interview before you leave the respondent's presence. You can't supply answers after you leave. Say, "Now, let's see if we've got everything," to allow you to look over each question to see that it is answered and the answer recorded correctly. This applies to the demographic data as well.

Checklist 3 is a list of "do's and don'ts" that mark a truly professional interviewer.

Checklist 3:  
Interviewing Cautions

Never do any of the following:

1. Never interview more than one person in the same family or the same group of Library users.

2. Never interview your friends. Strangers are preferred - because you'll find it easier to be objective and impartial with them.
3. Never have a friend or anyone else along when you do interviewing. Respondents will be more inhibited in the presence of "extra" interviewers.
4. Never allow anyone other than the designated respondent to answer your questions. Seek privacy. If others must be present and they start talking, or if the respondent asks for their opinions, tell him only his opinions are important. Gently but firmly instruct family members not to interrupt.
5. Never let someone else do the work for you. Substitutes are worthless, since you are the trained interviewer. If you cannot complete the work yourself, notify Jim Kennedy at once.
6. Never reveal the details of your job or of specific interviews to others. The information you obtain is confidential and you must respect this.
7. Never correct errors on someone else's advice. Instead, tell the director about your difficulties.
8. Never falsify interviews. All work is carefully examined and methods of detecting false information have been devised. It isn't worth the trouble to do the job poorly or wrong.

Always do each of the following:

1. Always follow instructions carefully.

2. Always study the questionnaire until you are familiar with all the questions.
3. Always use the brief introductory approach written into the questionnaire.
4. Always be completely neutral, informal, conscientious.
5. Always read questions just as they are written.
6. Always ask all of the questions.
7. Always ask questions in the order they appear.
8. Always record comments accurately.
9. Always interview only the proper person at the housing unit designated by your procedure.
10. Always check each questionnaire to make sure you have completed every item.
11. Always interview people you don't know, and interview them alone.